

**SPECIAL MEETING
BOARD OF MAYOR AND ALDERMEN**

January 31, 2006

6:00 PM

Mayor Guinta called the meeting to order.

Mayor Guinta called for the Pledge of Allegiance, this function being led by Alderman Garrity.

A moment of silent prayer was observed.

The Clerk called the roll. There were thirteen Aldermen present.

Present: Aldermen Roy, Gatsas, Long, Duval, Osborne, Pinard, O’Neil,
Lopez, Shea, DeVries, Garrity, Smith, Forest

Absent: Alderman Thibault

Mayor Guinta advised that the first purpose of the special meeting is a presentation of the Parks, Recreation and Cemetery Department Master Plan by representatives of the Peter J. Smith & Company, Inc.

Mr. Ron Ludwig, Director of Parks, Recreation and Cemetery Department, stated I’m honored to be here tonight to introduce the latest update of the Parks, Recreation and Cemetery Department’s Master Plan. The last time a Master Plan was done for the Parks Department was about in 1993 so we’re a little bit overdue in terms of accomplishing our goals here in terms of a plan. We began the process, which was quite lengthy back in February with an RFP process by which we interviewed several consultants and decided on a consultant from the Buffalo, New York area to undertake the Master Plan for us. To my right this evening from the Peter J. Smith Company from Buffalo is Eve Holberg and to her right is Andrew Schrauth. Both Eve and Andrew have spent significant time in the city over the last 10 or 11 months so they’ve become very familiar with our city and the various people and tried to get a good feel for what Manchester is, the history of Manchester and exactly how our system operates now and then bring forward their recommendations in terms of how they feel we should look going forward. We basically broke the plan into three segments, three phases I should say...Phase I was basically doing a complete Parks and Recreation inventory of facilities and programs, Phase II was a public outreach portion where they met with several focus groups and spent a significant amount of time meeting with all of our groups and organizations throughout the city. We tried to identify what we

felt to be some of the more important people that should speak with in terms of baseball, softball, hockey...we went right down the list and tried to get them in touch with as many people that we felt could provide us with good information and I think they've accomplished that goal...they met with Aldermen in small groups not too large and I think that we got some real nice feedback. Phase III is actually preparation of the Plan itself and then tonight's conclusion with the final document which is the Recovery Action Plan (RAP) which we used to smitten grant proposals and things of that nature...that's what they'll be presenting to you tonight. We're not going to go through the entire document, obviously, it's a lengthy document...makes for good reading. A couple things about our Master Plan if they don't mention it is that I want you to realize that the ideas and a lot of the ideas in the Master Plan came forward as a result of the people who had input in this process. This wasn't just the Parks and Recreation administrative staff giving all the ideas in terms of how things should look or function going forward so I just wanted to alert the Board to the fact that there may be some things in this plan that are aggressive, there may be some things in the plan we may not care for so I don't think we're necessarily looking at accepting the whole Plan but we are looking at a Plan that brought some innovation in terms of the way our consultants looked at it so it's really up to this Board and how it wants to accept the Plan, how it wants to use the Plan going forward. I think it's a good document, I think it lays out really a very good plan that we should try and follow over the next several years. I think the closer we can stick to the Plan I think the better off we'll all be in terms of accomplishing the needs and wants in everyone's individual wards and that will definitely benefit the whole city. Aside from that I just want to tell you that a Master Plan is not site specific, it's a Master Plan that looks at the entire Parks and Recreation Department so don't confuse it with issues related to a particular area where a more site specific plan would be warranted...that comes at a later date and that's why you see referenced in this Plan a lot of things that speak toward master planning in particular areas whether it be the Derryfield Park area or the Livingston Park area or the south end of Manchester. So, a lot of the recommendations lead towards master plans which then break down sites to more site specific plans in particular areas of the city. We tried to use an impartial judgment in terms of the way we assign some of our capital improvement projects to the Plan. In some cases we were driven by state mandates, for instance, over at Blodgett Park where we're under a state mandate to do something with the dam over there...take it down, build it up, fix it or whatever...so in the case of an area like Blodgett it was actually the state that was driving us in terms of where that came out on the list. With that we don't have a long, lengthy plan and that's the way we asked the consultants to deal with it and I'll now turn it over to Eve and Andrew. One other component of the plan that we asked them to do and Andrew is going to speak a little bit about it is a Maintenance Management Plan, which is a little bit different from the Master Plan. The Maintenance Management Plan actually involved creating a database for all of our facilities which we will be able to build on in the future and will hopefully help us in terms of how we budget for all of our parks, how we can become more efficient in what we do out there in our parks with the limited manpower that we have today. So, we asked the consultants to take on a separate component of the Master Plan and do a Maintenance

Management Plan. It's a useful tool, I think it will take us a little bit in terms of getting up to speed on how to use it and how more effectively to use it. But, it really works in today with the way cities should be trying to operate, in our opinion, in terms of accomplishing more with less and that's what we're attempting to do by asking them to do a Maintenance Management Plan for us.

Mr. Eve Holberg stated thank you very much. Once again my name is Eve Holberg and I've been your Project Manager for the City of Manchester Parks and Recreation Recovery Action Plan (RAP) and Master Plan update. This evening we'd like to quickly review the Recovery Action Plan which is really where the rubber meets the road in the Parks and Recreation Master Plan Update. The RAP Part I is the Assessment the Part II is the Action Plan then I am going to turn the mic over to my colleague Andrew and he'll talk a little bit about the inventory and Maintenance Manual. So, the Recovery Action Plan...what is the RAP and why do we need one and what is the difference between the Parks and Recreation Master Plan and the RAP. The Parks and Recreation Master Plan Update serves as the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Action Plan so it's the UPARR RAP. UPARR is a U. S. Department of the Interior National Park Service Program and it shouldn't be made light of because it is a matching grant program. Admittedly it has been pretty badly eviscerated by budget woes in recent years but you are required to have a RAP on file with the National Park Service in order to establish eligibility for certain grants. The information in the UPARR RAP section of the Master Plan and I know you've all had a chance to take at least a quick look at the plan so that you know that in the back is the RAP. Much of that information is restated from the Master Plan Update and encapsulated from the text of the plan itself...it's reorganized in the RAP to serve as a stand alone document to be consistent with previous UPARR RAP's and to address specific issues in areas that are in the UPARR RAP format. This part can be taken out, copied out and used as a stand alone document submitted to the National Park Service and submitted with grant applications so that you're not sending in this incredible 200 page document every time. Part I of the Assessment really sets the scene...where are we, where is Manchester, New Hampshire, what are the qualities of its population, what is the economic situation here, the land use, unemployment, industry, income, housing...all of these things and it also contains an overview of the Parks and Recreation system...that is the function of your Parks and Recreation Department within city government and it addresses, to a certain extent, need for expansion and development. RAP Part II the part that I'll be focusing most of comments on this evening is the recommendations to address Manchester's needs and then the Capital Improvement Program which is an aggressive program moving into the future. The recommendations of the RAP and of the Master Plan Update reclassify the parks so that they more reflect in their classification the culture and history and quality of the beautiful City of Manchester. Establish a network of access between parks among open spaces and especially to your waterfronts. Develop and celebrate an identity through your parks and open spaces, identify areas for acquisitions for parks. Manchester is a growing city and you have abundant and beautiful parks and open spaces but you have to continue to add to and maintain that

resource as the city grows in population. We recommend the potential for the development of an environmental education center at the closed landfill and that you continue to work with downtown stakeholders on downtown signature developments and gateways. We recommend that you study consolidating Derryfield Park, the country club and McIntyre Ski area within the context of the existing Country Club Master Plan. We recommend that you take a look at the feasibility of a regional sports complex community center through a feasibility study and we also recommend several other master planning processes that Ron addressed in his remarks...a Riverfront Master Plan...how do we tie together the various elements of our riverfronts and how do we tie those into the regional and super regional system and our multi use trail master plan. I know that there's trail development underway but what is the overall vision for trails here in Manchester, New Hampshire. We'd like to see you evaluate swimming and boating access on your rivers and waterfronts. In our management recommendations we recommend that you maintain an independent Parks, Recreation and Cemetery Department and that you study expansion of the role of the Parks Commission within city government...this is an element that was changed in a recent charter revision and we recommend perhaps looking at that again. We recommend that the city Parks, Recreation and Cemetery Department engage in a program feasibility cost benefit analysis. The city does not now offer through the Parks and Recreation Department programs that we believe should really be looking at to enhance the quality of life here in Manchester and we recommend that the City of Manchester Parks and Recreation Department add staff to enhance and expand parks operations. Part of the RAP includes a five-year Capital Improvement Program...the Capital Improvement Program addresses the key goals and objectives of the Master Plan. It's tailored to reflect preliminarily capital improvement budgets...we worked very closely with the department in developing this program. The costs are based on experience, estimated quantities and industry standard unit prices. Their order of magnitude only certainly as these things come up they will need to be subjected to analysis to make sure that the costs are on target. Certain costs were not included unless they were identified as included. Those include design, site planning, engineering, major streetscape improvements like curbing, pedestrian, paving and so on that would be part of it...so, really focuses on the parks themselves. In year 1 we're looking at some previously scheduled improvements that we folded into the Capital Improvement Program initiating the parks classification system and thereby the visibility and benefit of the parks. We have four projects...Piscataquog Park...that's the east which is the field and the landscaping...the first two years of a grant match...this is a 20% match...we're putting it in the project budget so that it comes up again next year...work at Martineau and Calef...Black Brook Dam...you're under order from the state to address Black Brook Dam either fix it or remove it so that moved from...to be honest with you it was not a year 1 priority until you got a nasty gram from the state and you'll have to address that...redevelopment of Calef Park, transforming Crystal Lake Park into an entertainment park...again, this kicks off the classification system...an entertainment park is a facility that could hold regional city wide festivals and events. It's a fairly intense development...restrooms, parking areas...the potential for athletic fields or not and we also recommend the feasibility study for the

regional sports complex community center and this is how it comes out in the budget department. It's almost \$2 million in Parks, Recreation and Cemetery and then you see below that a grid for school development and capital improvement programs. We worked again closely with the city department of Parks, Recreation and Cemetery which has been working, of course, on an on-going basis in development of these budgets they stand alone and that's almost \$1.6 million and includes design and engineering, athletics fields and those kinds of projects. Year 2...Piscataquog West...implementation of the Stark Park Master Plan...the Stark Park Master Plan was recently finished by Martha Lyon Landscape Architect and that implementation goes throughout this program. We'd love to see the resources available to implement that Master Plan all at once but in deference to reality we've put it in throughout our program. Accumulation of another match again that concludes this year...Amoskeag Memorial Walkway...design and engineering projects, our Master Plan recommendations are for the Derryfield Park including Weston Tower rehab, McIntyre and incorporating the DCC (Derryfield Country Club) Master Plan and a master plan for a city wide multi-use trail system and as you can see here this is how it shakes out in the budget department, it's about \$1.5 million...this is a big year for schools...we have lots of fields, general site rehabilitation of Parker Varney, all kinds of field rehabilitation and comes out to about \$3.7 million. Again, it's an aggressive and ambitious program designed to improve and enhance the qualities that make Manchester such a great place to live, work and do business and raise a family. Year 3...Bronstein and Oak Parks to enhance downtown...now based on the results of the multi-use trail master plan undertaken in Year 2 we have allowed \$300,000 for constructing trails and you'll see we've done this elsewhere in the program where we want to incorporate flexibility. We can't predict what the outcome of the master plans that we recommend are, we recommend the master plans but we want to budget for implementing them within the context of this Capital Improvement Program so we're not waiting until what would be your wait coming out from a master plan...so, the Riverfront Master Plan including a study of Arms Park will be initiated in this year so we're implementing the multi-use trail plan and kicking off another master plan and this is how it shakes out budget wise about \$1.6 million in Parks and Recreation facilities and in schools \$450,000 at Highland Goffs Falls for redevelopment of the existing field. Year 4...redevelopment of the athletic fields at Wolfe and Youngsville, redevelopment of Cullerot, Precourt, St. Anthony's Parks...these are all existing athletic based parks and what happens will be based on the outcome of the feasibility study for the regional sports complex. We are budgeting money to address these parks...whatever the outcome...whether it is moving them to another classification or rehabilitating the fields...however that shakes out we need to be ready to step up to the plate with the cash to do what needs to be done because they'll require rehabilitation if they're to stay and that comes out to about \$2.4 million and as you see the first three to be determined or field renovation and at the schools the playgrounds and general rehabilitation at Bakersville. The final year of the Capital Improvement Program...redevelopment of Brown Mitchell and Harriman Parks, redevelopment of Stevens Pond Park...again, based upon the outcome of that feasibility study, a master plan for the environmental center at the landfill and a master plan to develop

Rock Rimmon as an entertainment park. And, budget wise it comes out to about \$1.4 million. In the schools three projects including playgrounds and I know that you've noticed that in the plan we took a look at...we mapped all of the play parks and play sets throughout the city because we believe that nobody should be more than a 15-minute walk and recommended that we need some more play sets in the city and that's throughout the plan. So, in a real quick nutshell...there you have a synopsis of the Recovery Action Plan, which is your Parks and Recreation Master Plan Update. I want to thank you for your attention and for the opportunity to work here in the City of Manchester and I will turn it over to my colleague Andrew who will talk about the inventory and the maintenance standards.

Mr. Andrew Schrauth stated in terms of the inventory I'm going to only speak about the actual physical inventory, the resources of the Parks...not the programming aspect of it. What I will do is go over how the inventory was developed, what actually is the form of that inventory, how you can access it and then what do you do with it, how to use it. In terms of the Maintenance Standards Manual...again, what is it and again how can this benefit the Parks, Recreation and Cemetery Department. In terms of how it was developed...members of our firm walked through all the parks. We took extensive walks throughout just recording everything that was in there and making a note of what condition it was in...taking picture of it and with all that information we then are able to take that back and put it on a digital mapping. So, as you can see there are about 93 properties in total...55 parks, 19 mini parks which are for just either small pocket parks at corners or even just a sign and then the school grounds...19 of them that we looked at. Again, this does not look at any of the other additional responsibilities that the Parks Department has to oversee which would be the cemetery properties as well as all of the street trees in the city. In terms of the digital inventory database...what is it? It is actually a georeferenced or a geodatabase that is mapped as if it was on the earth's surface and what this allows you to do is create a spatial mapping and with that you can integrate it into the existing city's spatial mapping of other infrastructure or other items that they have. It will work right into that, it's comprehensive and you can interact with it to find out where things are, how many of those you have, how many are in this area or the whole city, it's very flexible in that regard. It also assesses each of the features of the facilities and there again the physical resources. We rated on conditions of...a rating of 1 to 5...1 being poor, 5 being good...1-2 being that you have to have some sort of maintenance involved, 3 being okay with the way it is...it may need something in the future...4-5 are very good and it'll be a long time before you need to do any maintenance. The one thing with this is that it does need to be kept up-to-date to be able to be used. If you do not do that in time you will not have an accurate recording of what you have out there and it will become no longer useful. How to use it...it can be used in many, many different ways and it can be flexible in terms of how your needs become but basically it can be used as a budgeting tool to look at the buying and the use of materials as well as the man hours you incorporate that into it in terms of how long it takes you to do certain items, you can also track when things wear out, when they can then be expected to wear out, track man hours and because of this tracking and budgeting you can begin to do some proactive

maintenance knowing that and anticipating that certain maintenance items will be needed or required in the future. It can help with scheduling in terms of coordinating where your work needs to happen and then you can find out where else in that certain area that this same work has to be done and get that all done more efficiently. It also works in terms of communicating what is the maintenance responsibilities of the Parks Department, what it is they do and they can easily show that...be able to explain that to someone with this by being able to print out reports in such a fashion as to what they did, what they maintained, how they maintained it. In reference to the Maintenance Manual...what it is is a small binder...I have one right here in front of me and inside of it it works in conjunction with the inventory to provide just general standards...minimum standards for maintaining the facilities in the parks. It outlines just the primary features and facilities, the activities that need to be performed to maintain them. Also in there we offer recommendations to improve the maintenance department's actions as well as it integrates with the digital database and it can work with that. Inside of that we give a brief explanation of the database and how to use it. This is an example of one of the types of the basic minimum maintenance schedules that can be set up or rather that you can use to guide you through your maintenance procedures. For example, playgrounds...that is one of the nine categories that we looked at. These nine categories were based out of the inventory, how that broke out. So, with playgrounds there are certain actions that we recommend that should be done throughout the season and given those items that are colored for those actions we broke it into a minimum recommended schedule in terms of when to perform those actions and then any notes that are involved with that. As such, this is just a basic guide so to speak to both the Maintenance Standards for the physical resources that you have as well as the digital database and with that I'd like to thank you for the opportunity to explain this to you and now you have your chance to have any of your questions answered.

Alderman DeVries stated I'd like to take us back to the capital outlays you put in place and I realize that the priority of the last several studies that we have and I think that Alderman Lopez was just telling me they go back to 1987 showing a priority for the south end of the city to have some sort of major park established, it's a major void and I'm just wondering how in that outlay of capital funds other than the Master Plan to study it if we were to follow each year the outlay of monies that you've put aside how are we getting closer to accomplishing our goal other than the Master Plan because there's nothing in there for an outlay of purchase of property or anything else so I'm just wondering how you built that into the capital planning version of your report. My fear being that people will look at that outlay and say okay we take care of this park, this park, this park...we're on course to establishing the goals but the major void is that we still aren't any closer to accomplishing anything for the south end of the city without a dollar amount holding a place in a capital plan.

Ms. Holberg replied I think the best answer for that is to say that as Ron pointed out in his remarks it's a 10-year plan with a 5-year capital improvement budget. We understand and we agree that there's a need in the south end of the city...we also know that land is tight.

We did not put in a number for acquisition, it doesn't necessarily cost very much to option a piece of property should one become available but the timeline for doing that study for that complex is it starts to be implemented in Year 3, so I think we saw it as a longer term thing. But, yes, you're absolutely right there is an area that's deficient that needs to be addressed.

Alderman DeVries asked would you agree that a better rationale to accomplish that goal might be each year to be putting a portion into a fund to accomplish the land purchase so that we aren't starting at ground zero six years out saying well we still have a million dollars or whatever it will take to accomplish. If we broke it yearly into a more manageable number saving towards the potential land purchase we might actually get there some day.

Ms. Holberg stated sure absolutely and the plan is to be flexible and there's no reason why you couldn't take a look at this and go back and say let's do this, let's refigure this and put in and start saving for this and I think that's wonderful if you want to make a commitment to establish a piggy bank for that.

Alderman DeVries stated on a far more positive note I am very encouraged that your direction takes us to the multi-use recreational trail because I think that is today an area that the city does not capitalize, it probably is not as expensive as some of the major park renovations or acquisitions and really brings us to what you have highlighted as the number one desire to have the passive recreation...the hiking, walking trails available to them. Any city that I have visited...an urban area that strikes me as someplace I want to go back to has always had some sort of a memorable walking trail in the city. I agree with you in your report in highlighting that that we need to look at how we can capitalize on that and maybe link some of our existing parks together and develop it better where we don't have sidewalks and in all of our city we could find another way for our citizens to make use of the land in between and whether it's on the right-of-way of existing streets or capitalizing other lands that are city owned we need to address that and it probably isn't as expensive as some of the other options before us.

Alderman Shea stated I'd be interested in finding out and I'm not sure whether...you're the messenger...but, I calculated \$15, 137,460 to implement what you have presented this evening...that includes the school portion of it. I'm wondering where's the money going to come from. I know you people don't know that because you're just presenting this but I'm wondering if in approaching this particular study if it wouldn't be more judicious for people within city government per se to look at this and say this is not going to be accomplished the way the city budget is going to be presented to us naturally because we're in a particular area where it's a downsize now, the bubble has burst, there's plenty of people that are hurting, health care's going up, the expenses of running a home are going up, etc...my concern would be how can we be realistic in approaching this, analyzing it and picking out the important elements of this to implement, not trying to present this. So, Ron or someone else, as you look at this how do you...without putting it back onto the Aldermanic Board for

expenditures...how would you go about trying to implement this? What do you see in this as the major focus that we should be concentrating on as the people who prepare budgets and give you expenditures and so forth?

Mr. Ludwig replied I'm not sure if that's for me to answer or for the Board to answer, quite frankly. But, in my opinion we can only move forward and I understand...I think people are hurting out there and I think that certainly a question this year of whether you're going to put oil in your tank or you're going to go skiing or something...in other words a master plan has to lay out a plan irrespective of whether you have the money for it at a particular time that it's implemented or not and this plan, as I said before it's a Master Plan, it does not lay out year-to-year-to-year and I think the Mayor's already indicated that it's an aggressive plan. I think that the Aldermen at least have in front of them in hard copy to attempt to follow and that's all it really does and whether it takes five years or ten years or even 15 years it's still a plan and I think that to the extent that you can follow the plan it lays out, it makes your CIP process a little bit less complex each year, it stops some of the infighting in terms of who should get what in what ward and I think that's what the plan really tries to do and just lays out a simpler process for that. Again, I thought that the way that the consultant has broken it out in terms of recreational trails as Alderman DeVries has said...these are inexpensive things that don't really require a lot of maintenance or upkeep to bring a lot of benefit to a lot of people and quite honestly trails are something that if we could just get a few of them connected would become far more used in terms of running and biking. Now, some of the other items that we're mentioning here are playground and such...I don't know if there's an answer to that question, quite frankly. I don't have a crystal ball in terms of where you find \$15 million dollars but I don't think the plan really says let's go find \$15 million right now.

Alderman Shea stated what I'm trying to say and I don't want to monopolize the conversation but if the door is too wide people are going to take this and they are not going to do anything with it they're going to look at it and say it's a very well prepared plan but they're not going to do anything with it. As the Director of Parks and Recreation along with the expertise that you have within your department what I'm saying is wouldn't it make more sense if you and the other members of your particular commission as well as the people working with you were to come back and say this is a very wonderful Master Plan, however, being realistic it took me four years to get \$600,000 for Prout's Park, it was divided...I'm just using that as an analogy. So, basically we're talking millions of dollars and I'm saying in order to make it continuous and not break it up into a dichotomous kind of thing but continuous what I'm saying is wouldn't it make more sense to highlight certain items that would be the most practical, get the community behind this particular plan seeing the benefits of it by having improvements made to different parks with the personnel necessary. I know that Al Heidenreich came here and he mentioned why put more parks if you don't have the personnel. So, these are all the considerations that you have to be realistic about and that's what I'm trying to indicate. If you, for instance, improved parks but can't get people to maintain the parks what good is it to add to these parks. So, I'm just saying let's

take one step at a time rather than trying to present something because it's not going to go anyplace. This isn't going to go anyplace if all these things are thrown at once...that's my comment...thanks, the presentation is very well appreciated.

Alderman Roy stated to brief questions...you talked about the digital database. Can that be integrated with our GIS System and when would be my first question?

Mr. Schrauth replied I believe your GIS System is Version 9...yes, it can immediately be done. We have the database in such a format...not a DBF but an MD whatever in access that you can pull it right in and run with it.

Alderman Roy stated the second question is more of an overview. We as the former Chairman (Alderman Shea) was mentioning surrounded ourselves in the City of Manchester and don't get to go to Minneapolis and St. Cloud and other places and look at their park systems. How does Manchester rate in your unbiased opinion as to what we have for acreage, how we maintain it, cost per resident, some of the facts that you put in the report but just in a brief overview what is your opinion of how we take care of what we have?

Ms. Holberg replied I think the numbers show that there's more than adequate open space per resident when you apply a national standard, which is a fairly subjective standard but you have to start somewhere. In terms of the expenditure per resident I'm not looking at the table that we have in here but I think that the issue going forward for the City of Manchester in terms of its...and it is a beautiful and historic and famous city for its beauty and its culture and it has your parks and recreation resources are beautiful and we were very impressed with them but we're concerned because you're a growth area and your population is going to grow and you are in a situation where you're in a regional competitiveness with some of your sister cities fighting for the population that's moving up from Boston and as you move forward I think those are some of the issues that we raise in the Plan that really have to be addressed in terms of maintaining the quality of life in Manchester.

Alderman O'Neil stated I want to apologize in advance because this usually isn't me but I actually found this report pretty interesting and wrote out a whole lot of questions, so I will gladly give up at some point and you can come back to me. So, I ask for the patience of my colleagues on this one usually a couple of questions and I'm out of it, but I actually read this and I think to open up with...as we know with other studies they're usually not well-written many times and not easy to follow and I first of all want to congratulate the consultants for that. I found it a very user-friendly study and I need to commend you for that because we don't always get those. Let me start off with just a few things and I did this in order as it followed along. On page 12 you talk about impact fees. Have we missed the curve on impact fees?

Ms. Holberg replied I think you can use impact fees...my understanding is and my analysis was that you would be able to use impact fees to fund acquisitions for parks and recreation.

Alderman O'Neil stated I guess my question is...have we missed the curve. We've seen the building boom, there's still a little bit going on, have we missed the curve on impact fees. You may not be the appropriate one to answer that but it is mentioned in there as a way to pay for acquisition or park improvements but we've used it to build fire stations in some of the newer sections of the city but I just throw that out there. On page 13 you talk about the environmental education center...are you aware of any funding opportunities to do a project like that?

Ms. Holberg replied I'm not aware of specific funding opportunities although we are generally aware of efforts on behalf of the federal government especially to address compromised sites.

Alderman O'Neil stated you talk about consolidating Derryfield Park, Derryfield Country Club and McIntyre into one park system. What are the true advantages of that and are there any disadvantages?

Ms. Holberg replied well would be the subject of the outcome of the Master Plan. We looked for ways to link those parks together, to increase their use in their shoulder seasons, to increase the safety and use particularly the Weston Tower area...Derryfield Country Club is a wonderful asset being loved to death and so is there an opportunity to perhaps provide some expansion area.

Alderman O'Neil asked do you see it as an opportunity to consolidate maintenance efforts meaning you might have a crew based out of somewhere in that vicinity that they just take care of Derryfield Country Club, Derryfield Park and McIntyre?

Ms. Holberg replied I think that the Maintenance Manual addresses that more than...we didn't look at that as a specific issue in that regard.

Alderman O'Neil stated you don't think there is an advantage to it.

Mr. Schrauth stated we didn't look at that specifically. What we looked at is tried to...overall in the whole park system...tried to get a value for putting together a lot of activities in one area such that there could be a reduction in terms of maintenance in traveling from place-to-place.

Alderman O'Neil stated regarding the regional sports complex...I have a concern about spending \$125,000 in Year 1 when we don't have a clue where it's going to be. Do you still do the study even though you don't have a location?

Ms. Holberg replied I think the study will help you determine where it will be.

Alderman O'Neil stated the Riverfront Master Plan what will it show?

Ms. Holberg stated first of all you have a riverfront in Manchester, a riverfront that links to a larger corridor and to a corridor that goes from Canada all the way down. You have opportunities for recreation in the water, you have a kayak course, you have whitewater opportunities so how do you use all of that in the context of the parks and recreation programming recreation opportunities for residents primarily and also visitors to the City of Manchester to build an image of Manchester as a riverfront city. This city was founded on its river.

Alderman O'Neil stated on page 15 you talk about the Multi-Use trail Master Plan...we have spent tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands of dollars throughout the city for a trail system that goes nowhere and it's something that at one time I supported, I've stopped supporting it because it doesn't go anywhere. Is this really going to give us the tools to put a trail system together that is usable?

Ms. Holberg replied very briefly two answers to that. It's not unusual for a city to develop a trail system in bits and spurts like that and it is frustrating for the city leaders and it's frustrating for the city residents because as the money becomes available this piece is developed and then that piece is developed...you're at a point now where yes you need to look at a plan of how are we going to finish off some of this and put it together so it really does start to get to be a little bit more useful and a little bit more of an asset for the region's residents.

Alderman O'Neil stated two more, your Honor, and then you can give me the hook for a little while.

Mayor Guinta stated okay.

Alderman O'Neil stated thank you. You talk about the swimming and boating access and we talk about...was there any discussion about the water quality at Nutts Pond and at Dorr's Pond.

Ms. Holberg replied yes.

Alderman O'Neil stated I can specifically remember as a kid swimming at Nutts Pond and maybe even took a dip in Dorr's Pond over the year but what do we know about the water quality in those bodies?

Ms. Holberg replied we know that it may not be feasible to reintroduce swimming in those areas because of the water quality at this time.

Alderman O'Neil stated it would be quite expensive to correct.

Ms. Holberg stated we didn't even go down that road.

Alderman O'Neil stated so just your first look says.

Ms. Holberg stated based on the local experts that we consulted.

Alderman O'Neil asked who might that be?

Ms. Holberg replied I can't.

Alderman O'Neil stated Urban Ponds made that determination. I'm just curious. I've never seen that come up and we've kind of written them off for some reason as we once wrote off the Merrimack River and you can now swim in it above the dam so I'm not necessarily convinced that they should be written off. I'd like to see some data but I guess your charge was not to do that.

Ms. Holberg stated correct.

Alderman O'Neil stated you talk about splash pads versus pools and we seem to keep making significant investment into pools and you seem to indicate that splash pads will be a little more economical, a little safer, etc.

Mr. Schrauth stated they require a lot less maintenance especially day-to-day, hands-on maintenance than pools do. They can be used longer periods in the season rather than a pool. You don't need long period of warm weather. It can be if you have a warm spell it can be opened up, you can set it so that it is either at a certain schedule or as a user comes up to it they can use it. But, yes, they typically are and can be built such that they have a lower operating cost, much lower operating costs than pools yet still afford that water experience.

Alderman O'Neil asked how new a thinking is that because I can't say I've ever seen one?

Mr. Schrauth replied it's not that new.

Alderman O'Neil stated they probably have them at theme parks and things like that.

Mr. Schrauth stated it can be as simple as just fountains that are...spray heads that are at grade...there's nothing above ground but you have a pad that is slightly dishd, has a drain

in the middle and you have certain either programmed or non-programmed spray heads that come out from that. It's literally that simple or it can be as intricate as large structures that spray water in different patterns.

Alderman O'Neil stated one more, your Honor, and then I'll take a breather. You talked about this in your presentation...why wasn't streetscapes improvements included because for me it doesn't paint a picture of the entire cost and we go through this regularly not just with parks and I think that this particular group of Aldermen have kind of addressed it over the last few years but there was a period of time we'd get a price to redo a fire station but it didn't include the grounds, etc., etc. We need to get true costs and I'm just wondering why those weren't included.

Mr. Schrauth stated we took that approach because we were looking at the actual Parks, Recreation and Cemetery Department...their needs and this would be outside their bounds, this would be dealt with either the Public Works Department, most likely and they may have a different schedule or a different timeline or something different that was out of the realm of the Parks, Recreation and Cemetery Department.

Alderman O'Neil stated would you agree that if you're doing parking at a parks facility...the curbing and lighting and that should be part...to be honest with you we missed an opportunity I think when we redid Derryfield Park especially around Reservoir Avenue site we came back...I think through some other funding sources I think we're adding curbing if I recall to Reservoir Avenue...Chuck's shaking his head yes in the back but one of the things we missed, all of us was lighting in my opinion...it's pretty dark around Reservoir Avenue at night and early morning when people like to run and walk and I think for a low cost we could have put in some type of lighting around that area so I have a concern that it's not included and I do appreciate that you identify which projects it's not included in but I guess that's more a comment or an editorial than anything else but we need to have full estimates on those, so thank you, your Honor.

Alderman Lopez stated just a note before I get started. We had flash pads in the City of Manchester, we had them at the Center of New Hampshire, Stanton Plaza and we had them up at one of our other parks and they lasted about three months after we put a lot of money into them and they were destroyed/vandalism.

Mr. Schrauth stated it depends on how you design them. You can design it in such a way that they're very hard to vandalize.

Alderman Lopez stated I just wanted to make a couple of comments. One, I think your report is excellent...the Maintenance Report we don't have...apparently, you have a copy of it but in 1987 we had the same thing but yours is a lot more flashier because of more digital information you were able to complete but I want to read something to you and ask you for

your comments...one of the recommendations in 1987 was based on the review of both manpower and the routine work/tasks... “is impossible for the existing full-time staff to perform additional work such as building new recreational facilities as well as their daily tasks. The result in performing house construction and utilizing the existing workforce leads to routine maintenance being neglected.” Do you agree with that statement of 20 years ago as it would apply today?

Mr. Schrauth stated to restate that you’re saying that if the Parks and Recreation Department were required to build a new facility that that would take away from their day-to-day maintenance.

Alderman Lopez stated what I’m saying is that 20 years ago, 18 years ago it was stated that with the existing force at Parks and Recreation they didn’t know they maintained all these parks and in your maintenance report...I know in this particular maintenance report it tells how many hours it takes to go over Wolfe Park and set up a ballfield or cut the grass for two hours...all the islands in the City of Manchester belong to Parks and Recreation...I’m sure you looked at that, do you think there’s adequate staff to do all of this?

Mr. Schrauth replied no we don’t.

Alderman Lopez stated in 19992 we did a Recovery Action Plan like this...I’m sure you’re familiar with it because I brought it to your attention...we completed over 95% of those items...this is the Master Plan for Livingston Park which goes beyond what you’re talking about, your plan here...I really think you did an outstanding job in bringing everything to light because you’re recreational people and that’s what you do and that’s your profession. It’s up to the policy makers to decide which way they’re going and I’m sure you realize that but to talk a little bit more about a regional sports complex...I’d like to have your philosophy on it. Why has Manchester become a regional for all of the places around. Why do we need a regional...to satisfy other communities who do nothing in their community such as, for example, you indicate in your report that we should have one swimming pool for every 50,000...I believe I read it right...that’s a national standard...and you go back to we shouldn’t be making more swimming pools, make splash pads and all that...why do we have to be a regional...maybe I’m going beyond but why a regional sports complex?

Ms. Holberg replied I think that’s what the outcome of the study that we have recommended will tell you. What we heard when we talked to recreation leaders and civic leaders and just plain folks in the City of Manchester was that you have some real issues in your athletic fields, your demand...overall the demand for recreation facilities far outstrips their provision. You have situations now where you have season...it used to be you played baseball in the summer, you played hockey in the winter...but, sports are more and more going into three seasons with the end of Title IX which required you, schools and everybody to consider provision of facilities for girls and women...in sports you have an overwhelming

demand. You also have a very active sports scene here locally...you had we thought an opportunity to provide to study the potential to provide a center where you could have regional tournaments for the area where you could bring people to Manchester to engage in their tournaments...particularly when you're looking at tournaments that are kind of a round robin thing where you're out, I move to the next field and we play right away...it helps if you're not trying to ask people to run all over a city that they may not be familiar with and to be quite frank it has the potential to serve as an economic engine or contributor to the economic engine for the City of Manchester because they would be coming here and parting with their lovely money as opposed to going to somebody's regional complex and parting with it there.

Alderman Lopez asked can you give me an example...somewhere in the country where this was done by a city or a private development.

Mr. Schrauth stated yes I can give you at least some vague reference but let me go back to that there's other reasons why a sports complex may be feasible here...part of it is that in your existing parks that you have wedged in a lot of sports fields and they are quite cramped and in some of the parks this would afford you an opportunity to get better facilities as well as freeing up the parks for more of the general public rather than a one-use or two-use space. It allows you to bring the best to the public in terms of recreation and again that study should determine whether or not that is the best feasible way of doing it. In terms of other areas that have done this...an individual in our office Paul Caravate who is from an area around Toronto, Canada where they have several large sports complexes that his daughter is involved in softball and they routinely go to these on the weekends during the summer and he is impressed by the amount of people that are there, the amount of revenue that must be generated, the caliber of the fields and it is just an opportunity for Manchester to become more of a regional...not supplier of this but just to capitalize on the ability to do that for the surrounding communities and for yourselves.

Alderman Lopez stated it is true and the civic center sort of proved that that we've become regional for the entire state. I'm just wondering if there's a big enough area, you mentioned Canada but is there a place in the United States where 128,000 have a sports complex sponsored by the city?

Mr. Schrauth replied I don't know that off-hand.

Alderman Lopez stated during the period of making this great document you mention the riverfront...did you see any back documents in reference to the riverfront such as Arms Park was supposed to be all grass at one time, there was a bridge across the river to go on the other side and have a nice play area over there and a beach type area on the other side of the river...did you see any plans like that?

Ms. Holberg replied I think we're generally aware that the river has been a focus by the city...maybe not specifically aware of that but generally aware that there has been an effort to...and this is common for cities throughout North America that have turned their backs on their rivers to turn again to face the river and embrace it.

Alderman Lopez stated I would like to go back to the trails...there are bicycle trails...I can't think of the name off hand but we have trails all the way up to Berlin and all the way from Massachusetts border down through Manchester and we're talking about the west side right now and going down to the West Side Arena...as a matter of fact Alderman Smith and I were at a meeting the other day talking about that...the walkway over on Second Street...people can bicycle and all that through the trails that we have...maybe I'm missing something when you mentioned it but what are you referring to when you say "trails"? Are you talking about our particular program or a new one?

Mr. Schrauth stated in terms of the trails we're talking about using them to help reconnect, reorganize and allow access to all of your existing parks. It will just make for a better workable system overall and these trails can be a variety of whether they're part of the on-street right-of-way or whether they're part of a sidewalk or whether they're pushed off and they are their own separate entity depending upon how you can do it and manage it within the city and what the existing conditions are...that's what we're recommending that you use it to help bolster your existing system.

Alderman Lopez stated I have just one more if I may. Thank you. We talk about Derryfield Park and I think Alderman O'Neil mentioned a little bit about it...Weston Tower...we fixed that tower twice in 30 years and it deteriorated because of vandalism, undesirables going in the area...as professional recreational people how do we counter that...we through money into a lot of things that we have no control over...vandalism or undesirable people...so, why do it.

Mr. Schrauth stated not a system but making it a way that such that it is less likely that it will be vandalized so that it's not such an insulated place up there, that it's more part of a larger system, that it's used more often, that it has more visibility to it and that will help greatly decrease the chance that it will become vandalized again. We're not saying that you just do that in a piece...that you make that better and then leave it alone but it's part of a whole system that has to work together and in that togetherness it will then help to ward off, so to speak, the undesirable activities.

Alderman Lopez stated when you did this I'm sure that you understand the makeup of the City of Manchester having 12 aldermen, 12 wards, 12 cities in one...what would you say about...oh, it wouldn't be a fair question so I'll just let it go. Thank you.

Alderman Forest stated I think a lot of us have read it, a lot of us had some input in it along with Ron and the people at Parks and Recreation and we appreciate that. I have a couple of comments and again it was mentioned that the total overlay or the total price for all of these was somewhere around \$15 million. No question in my mind that that's a lot of money and it's a lot of money that the taxpayers at one point or another may have to foot the bill on but it's not something that we as a city or a Board are going to do tomorrow. I believe the plan is a long-range plan and I want to make a quote and I can't remember who said it...all I know is that I was at a brainstorming meeting last summer with a lot of the downtown merchants and a comment was made about...well, we don't get enough money to complete these projects...well, the merchant that was there and I'm sorry I don't remember who he was said that you do get \$200,000 a year so do something with it. You have to start somewhere and I believe in this whole plan we have to start somewhere whether we build a clubhouse or we plant some grass or we let Ron hire two more guys so he can cut the grass every week instead of every other week, we have to start somewhere. We can't wait...Manchester had a mentality many years ago...build it and then let it fall apart till we build it again. We can't do that. We've got to maintain what we have and we've got to expand what we have...there are a lot of members of this Board including myself that have been involved with softball, baseball, football, Boys' Club...30, 40, 50 years some of us and we know what some of these fields were and we know what some of these parks were...they're starting to improve a little bit at a time and we've got to give Parks and Recreation the tools and the manpower to do something and again it was commented earlier that this isn't going anywhere. Well, let me tell you in my opinion I think with the Board we have here it's not all going to go tomorrow but this will go somewhere...we've got to start with a nail and a board somewhere and I think this plan is a good place to start.

Alderman Osborne stated first of all this is a good Master Plan, I have nothing against the Master Plan itself, I call it a recipe. But, you have to be able to put it in the pot. Basically, I think...how many of these have you put together?

Ms. Holberg replied over 20 years of professional practice in our office, we've done...it's hard for me to say because I haven't been there over 20 years, I know we've done several in the last several years...it takes a year, we are well-experienced in Parks and Recreation master plans.

Alderman Osborne stated when you go into these different towns or cities and you do this particular master plan do you look at their infrastructure as well as the parks and so on, the city itself?

Ms. Holberg replied no we look at the parks infrastructure.

Alderman Osborne stated like you say \$15 million Alderman Forest is a lot of money especially when I see the infrastructure...I'm just twisting it a little bit here but these are my

feelings about it...we see a lot of infrastructure in the City of Manchester like sidewalks...we don't have sidewalks that people can even walk on to go to the grocery store and we keep spending money on these different things. How would you say right now...what condition do you say the parks are in right now at the present?

Ms. Holberg replied I think it ranges all over. I think some of your parks are in wonderful condition and I think some parks really need to be addressed. I see evidence that you have been addressing them and that you are addressing them and with all due respect I absolutely agree as a person who has been coming to Manchester on a regular basis and running on your streets I have very nearly tripped on some sidewalks so how do we fund a trail when we need to fund a sidewalk...well, why don't we call the sidewalk the trail and get the funding there.

Alderman Osborne stated that would be fine as long as it's in the wards, I have no problem with that. I just can't see us keep going and going and not taking care of our infrastructure...I'm a constituent alderman type of guy, so this is the way I feel but no it's a great plan, there's no timeline, it doesn't tell you when to start and when to stop so this is all up to the Board I'm sure but I have my priorities too. I appreciate your time. Thank you.

Mayor Guinta asked does anyone want to speak before we go around to people who have already spoken?

Alderman Smith stated I really think that the steering committee and the Peter Smith group here did a wonderful job. I really think that in talking with the people...we have a Community Improvement Plan and it's up to let the Director and the Commissioners submit that list to the Planning Board with Bob MacKenzie and to prioritize these options. There's a lot on the plate but I think it's very fruitful and I want to thank you...a lot of things that I didn't think of are in here and I certainly appreciate the report. Thank you.

Alderman DeVries stated I want to take us back to the RAP, the UPARR RAP I think is what you called it...potential source of funding for some of the improvements...50/50 match I believe you indicated and I realize that you said that that has been fairly eviscerated in the federal budget process but maybe you can tell me how we have been able to tap UPARR funds in the past for any of our past project and that might be our Parks Director's job and then which of the potential capital projects might be more likely to capture those funds in a more competitive time that we're in today.

Ms. Holberg replied I'll start off by saying that without having your UPARR Recovery Action Plan on file with the National Parks Service you miss out on the potential to get...it's not a funding stream but as you know there are things that put you in a better position to get a grant, you get higher points when your grant applications are reviewed and assessed by various grants panels so whether or not you would possibly get UPARR funding...that you

have a RAP, that you have a plan, that you have a strategy for getting from A to B and that it's on file with the National Parks Service gives you a boost. You'll notice in our Capital Improvement Program the first two years is the accumulation of a 20% match for some parks projects...that means that your Parks and Recreation and Cemetery Department has gone out or somebody has gone out and gotten 80% of those projects funded and so obviously there's a great deal of local knowledge about where the money is.

Alderman DeVries stated if I could ask the Director...the last plan...I think Alderman Lopez has indicated went in in 1992 and have we benefited from UPARR grants since 1992?

Mr. Ludwig replied I think we've benefited greatly. What we've lost in the last year-and-a-half is I think the gentleman had a great record in being able to write and secure those grants and that's Ron Johnson, it's not me, I'm not a grant writer. In fact, it's a lengthy process to write grants. Since we've lost him I think you can look back at that record and say yeah we've definitely benefited and we continue to benefit to some degree in that regard but hopefully we can pick back up and get some more. Dennis Hebert has jumped in with us on a couple of small opportunities recently and he's helped us a little bit which is a good thing...helped Chuck a little bit but right now we suffer. This is the time of the year when Ron used to put together grants for us on a yearly basis or even a couple of months prior to this...I don't think we've missed out on much so far but he had a pretty good success rate.

Alderman DeVries stated maybe I'm not being specific enough...have we received federal dollars in the form of grants for any of our parks and I'm just curious which was the last park that benefited from federal dollars...would that be Bronstein or some of the downtown parks?

Mr. Ludwig replied mostly the downtown parks are qualified for Community Development Block Grant monies. Other than that it's just trail work.

Alderman DeVries stated that's all part of this UPARR authorization that needs to go in.

Mr. Ludwig replied that's correct.

Alderman DeVries stated on the on-going policy discussion that we're having...user fee basis of funding our parks versus supplementing our parks system and our youth recreation programs in our annual budget and you touched on the user fee basis as a source of funding in some of the portions of this report and I just wondered if you could elaborate for me how you have seen other communities use user fee versus what we are currently doing in the City of Manchester supplementing and really having a variety or greatly reduced programs. I think that's what you were trying to tell us in the report that we aren't capitalizing all of the user fees...I'd like to hear your perspective on what you think we're missing so we can make our policy decisions at a later date.

Ms. Holberg replied our perspective is that it's certainly something that you could look at. I think that there's a lot of resistance to that and that it's a fairly hard thing to introduce particularly in a situation where you have a lot of people who maybe won't take advantage or can't take advantage of Parks and Recreation programs and facilities if they're a user fee associated with those and maybe the city needs to look at ways to subsidize those particular most needy people but that...communities and we've seen many of them three ways to finance your programs...one is direct subsidy through the budget, one is user fee and the other is to just put it into a...that's your tax rate, the levy is this and this is the new facility that we're putting in. Again, it's worth studying and it's worth engaging the community in this conversation and finding out what they demand and what they're willing to perhaps come and help you pay for without recognizing that the provision of adequate open space for the population is your mandate and you need to do that but maybe some of the other things can come with a price tag, maybe it's most and in some cases maybe it's not.

Alderman DeVries stated I'm certainly not endorsing that we move in that direction. I think it's a policy discussion and decision and as you said bringing the community in is certainly a piece of that. But, I'm looking for your knowledge that you bring to this discussion tonight for what you have seen in other communities, how they are trending maybe toward more user fees than they've had in the past and do you have any history that you'd like to add to this conversation.

Ms. Holberg replied there are many communities some of which are near here and some of which are near where we are in Buffalo that have incorporated user fees for a wide variety of more recreational kinds of programs that are in some cases no brainers...for example, in the Buffalo area if there is a community that doesn't have a bus going to away Buffalo Bills games that are reachable by one day's bus ride and one day back then Parks and Recreation programs run those and Parks and Recreation programs in this region run buses down to Boston to Fenway Park and they charge a certain amount and that's a program that's a user fee program that's a money maker for them that they can use then to turn around and benefit another program. Also, communities like...and again I go home to the Buffalo area...the Tonawanda's in Tonawanda, New York there's a beautiful new recreation facility that is subsidized by the taxpayers but there are programs that are held in there that are exercise programs, fitness programs that are on a fee basis.

Alderman Garrity stated Ron you stated earlier that your grant writing abilities decreased since Ron Johnson's left is that right. You already stated that you're not a grant writer.

Mr. Ludwig reiterated I'm not a grant writer.

Alderman Garrity stated we have a grant writer in this city and that's the way it was sold to this Board, to hire the grant writer to help out city departments and I continually hear that the

grant writer doesn't help out other city departments. Does the grant writer we currently have in the Planning Department...does he assist you at all with your requests.

Mr. Ludwig replied he has. Again, this is the time of the year for maybe a month or two before we start the budget process because we're pretty busy now but we used to spend some time trying to put together grants and make our way up to Concord to try and secure funds. Chuck continues to try to do that...

Alderman Garrity interjected we have a grant writer at City Hall.

Mr. Ludwig stated he has solicited as I indicated earlier assistance from Dennis Hebert in a smaller way. He's helping us out right now with the Weston Tower in securing some funds there. In the past he's been more of an added resource providing assistance and I used to have the same questions of Ron Johnson that you're asking of me in terms of don't we have a grant writer but I think as a department we had our own expertise, we had our own information pulled together. It was just as easy for Ron although I don't mean to say that writing a grant's easy, it's time consuming and he probably would have just been providing the information to Dennis but he's always been there to assist us, Alderman Garrity.

Alderman Garrity stated but since Ron Johnson's left your grant requests have decreased.

Mr. Ludwig stated I don't want to say that they've decreased. We still have received a couple of grants for South Manchester's trail work and such but they've been kind of continuations of existing grants that we've piggy backed and they just haven't come forward and they continue to come forward but as time goes on we could miss opportunities which wouldn't be a good thing.

Alderman Garrity asked is Kevin Clougherty here? Randy will work...Randy, a question for you. Since we don't have a grant writer at the Police Department, he's been gone a couple of years and since Ron Johnson's gone could I get kind of a history of the grants from Parks and Recreation and Police since Ron Johnson's left and I can't remember the grant writer from the Police Department a couple of years ago...

Alderman O'Neil interjected Marty Boisvert.

Alderman Garrity stated I would like to have a breakdown of grants while they were here and grants since they've left. Thank you, your Honor.

Mayor Guinta stated before I go to Alderman O'Neil in two weeks I want someone from your department identified as responsible for grant writing, number one. Number two, I've had department head meetings where I've said the Office of the Mayor will assist any department head, any department and any employee who would like to write grants. I'm of

the opinion that the city doesn't need to hire grant writers...we've got to be a little more innovative in how we approach go after existing funds for these areas. We've got a congressional delegation that is more than willing to assist us and help us and I would certainly tell this Board as I had told the department heads at the department head meeting last week that we are going to have a session with representatives of each congressional office...meet with the department heads and talk about grant writing and how easy it really is identifying federal funds. It's unacceptable to me that we need a grant writer in order to actually get a grant. I've written grants, many people can write grants. So, I think we need to take a different approach relative to that issue. So, I would certainly like to see someone identified in your office who is willing to pick up that role and if I need to teach him I will.

Alderman O'Neil in reference to school grounds asked has the School District concurred with the recommendations?

Mr. Ludwig replied we have had continuing dialogue with Bill Sanders and Dr. Aliberti as well as Dr. Bass over there in terms of how they would like to move forward, so I guess the answer would be yes.

Alderman O'Neil stated I know there's probably CIP requests coming forward but it says in Year 1 Memorial Phase II, Parker Varney, Hillside, Gossler and Parkside...in that direction or is this just kind of general and it's going to be adjusted.

Mr. Ludwig stated we made a presentation last Thursday night to the School District and what we conveyed to them on Thursday was don't go by the numbers this is just some of the requests that we've seen come forward from principals of schools in terms of some of the things they'd like to see done at their sites...Parker Varney whatever and it's really...they were taking votes Thursday night in terms of how they wanted to prioritize those items themselves.

Alderman O'Neil stated this can go to Andrew or Eve...you put it in the report so this is probably the one place I'm going to challenge you and I won't spend a lot of time on it and that's under your management recommendations...you bring up the word "consolidation" and the number of bullet points that you have in here I've got to be honest I didn't learn anything on why not to do a consolidation. You made some very general statements that didn't necessarily sell me on the pros and cons of consolidation. There is a statement in there that is pretty good though "one way the department"...and this could go to any department in the City of Manchester..."one way the department may be able to prevent the consolidation debate in the future is to seek more ways to collaborate and coordinate with partner organizations throughout city government." We should frame that and put that up, that's not just a Parks issue that's an issue for all 26 or 28 departments...how many do we have, your Honor?

Mayor Guinta replied they keep growing.

Alderman O'Neil stated I honestly don't know what expanding the role of the Parks Commission is going to do to make our park system better. Again, this is the one section I had a little bit of a problem with because I really didn't learn anything in that section. Can you just comment on what expanding the role of the Parks Commission would do to make our park system better?

Ms. Holberg replied I think as we look at the implementation of the Parks and Recreation Master Plan Update that the community members will have a lot of questions and you will want the community to have a lot of input in the implementation of this Plan. This Plan recommends a lot of studies, it is bold and aggressive and it has some ideas that may or may not be popular. Your Parks and Recreation Commissioners are completely committed to your Parks, Recreation and Cemetery Department...they're wonderful advocates and we're simply saying using them.

Alderman O'Neil stated I'm not sure where you were trying to go in the cost benefit analysis program. Can you explain that to me? I've read it a few times and I'm not really sure what you were attempting to accomplish there.

Ms. Holberg replied acknowledging that it will cost money for the city to start a more aggressive program, more recreation programming within the City's Parks, Recreation and Cemetery Department there is a cost to that and there's a benefit to it and some of the benefits may be in terms of costs, for example, running a bus to a sporting event and charging people enough so that you make some money on it and channeling that to something else, for example. And, it may be that there's a benefit that's a little less easy to count in terms of cash, for example, raising work readiness skills and job readiness skills here in the City of Manchester and making the use of Manchester more economically competitive. And, so recognizing that there are those costs and trying to get your arms around what are the benefits if it makes Manchester a better place to live, if it increases wealth in the community then what is the benefit of that well I think that's clear and I know that that's very sort of squishy and hard to put your arms around but at some point you have to ask what have we lost in not doing programming and not offering more recreation and educational programs through the community.

Alderman O'Neil asked are you talking about programs that already don't exist or is it a complete change in philosophy...for instance, I know the youth basketball program in the City of Nashua to our south is run by the City of Nashua...here it seems to be run primarily by either the School District or CYO. So, there'd be a major change in philosophy to now have the School District or CYO run our major basketball programs...that's what I'm trying to get a handle on. It seems like it's a real philosophical shift in the city.

Ms. Holberg stated it very well may be and that's why we wouldn't suggest to recommend one stance or another. We see a need for programming, who benefits and how much it costs is a matter of cost benefit analysis for the city to go in.

Alderman O'Neil asked who does that kind of study...not a particular firm...I'm just trying to get a feel...is it a planner, is it an economist.

Mayor Guinta interjected an internal auditor.

Ms. Holberg stated an economist would be a good place to start. If you'd like us to do some research.

Alderman O'Neil stated I'm just curious. I guess I wasn't comprehending...I understand now what you're trying to say but it seems like it's a major change in philosophy here about who's responsible for what.

Ms. Holberg stated it could be or it may not be.

Alderman O'Neil stated just a comment on the staffing. I do appreciate your comments and you talk about four new specialty positions in here and we've heard a lot of discussion about the need other general maintenance staff through parks...it's a balancing act for us at the same time we're trying to talk about adding additional police officers, maybe additional firefighters...it's a real balancing act. I'll try to run through just a couple of things quick. Just on the trends you seem to indicate that the only one that was really declining was youth hockey if I read that right.

Ms. Holberg stated yeah we found that interesting...that was a decline in participation and I believe that was a national number, was it not...it may or may not reflect the activities. This is the home of hockey, let's face it, this is hockey.

Alderman O'Neil stated it may have been and I may have read it wrong...okay, so that was a national trend. One of the things I did notice there didn't seem to be a lot of reference to lacrosse here and I'm wondering if they did not participate in the discussions.

Ms. Holberg stated we attempted to reach the leaders of a diverse and as many as possible sports in the city and it's impossible for me without going through our notes to determine whether we had the input of lacrosse but if we had input from lacrosse leaders it would be in the report.

Alderman O'Neil stated one of the things I really want to commend you on is your discussion about mini parks which in many cases honor our veterans, not exclusively, and it has been brought up before that they're really not and there's no one to blame for it it's just

that we really have not put an emphasis towards them like we should...Bob MacKenzie might recall a few years ago we had a discussion with a couple business people down by Maple and South Willow Streets where there is one and I'm drawing a blank on what that particular square is called and they wanted to participate but we really didn't know how to get off the ground with it. We talked about is it a park's project, is it a highway project, is it a Traffic Department project and I really want to commend you for that because in many cities they do honor their veterans and others appropriately and it's something we can probably start...Andrew, you're smiling is that yours...

Ms. Schrauth stated it's a valid resource that you have that you're not utilizing at all.

Alderman O'Neil stated it's a great point and I think for not a lot of money we can start a program with that. On page 151 is your summary of your findings...am I correct if I'm reading all of this right that we seem to be short in 13 out of 21 activities...am I reading that correctly?

Ms. Holberg replied I've never actually added them up.

Alderman O'Neil stated I think you identified 21 activities and if I'm reading them right 13...does that seem somewhat right?

Ms. Holberg replied yes.

Alderman O'Neil asked is it a case of we don't have the facilities...using the term facilities I'm talking fields or it could be buildings or is it just we're not allocating the proper time to them or a combination of the two?

Ms. Holberg replied I think it could be a combination of the two. It was certainly our observation that there is incredible demand for your playing fields specifically. Incredible demand to the level that they're really not getting an opportunity...the Parks and Recreation maintenance people to get in there and resurface some of the fields and maintain them in a way...some of them...in a way that makes them popular with people who want to play them so there is a great demand for better conditioned fields and that brings the conditioned fields down and so I know that this is a challenge that we discussed.

Alderman O'Neil stated I don't want to speak for you but you're saying we're certainly getting our money's worth out of the use of the facilities.

Ms. Holberg replied I would say so.

Alderman O'Neil asked are they overused is that a good statement...many of them?

Ms. Holberg replied many of them yes.

Alderman O'Neil stated just one final question and before I ask it I just want to say I really think you did a fabulous job with this. I know you got me thinking about a lot of things and I appreciate that. One of the things I thought was going to come out of this and it may be in here and I might be missing it is development standards. If we have a neighborhood park, what I'll classify as a neighborhood park that it says okay you're going to have a playground and it needs to be so big with similar...that each neighborhood park would look the same, it would have similar equipment...we have a tendency and I think the department's tried to get a hold of that or if we have I don't know what to call the next step out beyond a neighborhood park...I don't want to use the word regional because I know that set off a discussion earlier but a sectional park in the city...southeast Manchester, north Manchester...that that should have some design standards to say okay if you're going to do that you should have a playground so big, you should have...did I miss that in the report and it could include recreational...if you do a...the little bit I know from being around here generally if you have a soccer field you can fit many other activities inside it...lacrosse fits inside, I think field hockey fits inside...but, I seemed to miss that in the report if it's in there.

Ms. Holberg stated you're talking about standards that are published by NPRA (National Parks and Recreation Association) and we do have a grid for provision of facilities but we have talked...and the NPRA standards are well-known by the Parks and Recreation Department...what we have recommended and the graphics that we show and the typical cross sections that we show are for the proposed new parks classification that we'd like to see you implement which shows something that harkens back more to the culture and cultural identify and heritage of the City of Manchester and it specifically run through in an entertainment park, it's a high intensity use, it would accommodate for example festivals and activities and play parks and a typical school park and I know Andrew wanted to add something.

Mr. Schrauth stated it's not that we're suggesting that each play park will look the same. It's more we're suggesting that they will be designed in a similar fashion so that you could have different play structures in each play park but that it accommodates or it functions in a similar manner to all other play parks, it is maintained in a similar manner so it's level of maintenance is understood and can be in that regard somewhat managed better. An entertainment park could be more for a sports entertainment so you have large fields there that are programmed or it could be a cultural theater and be toward that event but it's more of looking at rather than the actual acreage of a park to determine what it's function is. More of defining the park in terms of okay this is its function no matter what the size it is because of its context this is how we deal with it.

Alderman O'Neil stated I guess my concern is we have a history in the city of trying to make things fit and we don't always building...we want to do a soccer field but we don't always

build a regulation soccer field...my point being that I think and Ron talked about it earlier in his opening statement about maybe we take parts of this, maybe we don't...to me I think we have to have and I hate to use the term "a bible" but a solid document that we adopt and that we use it. We do it with our Airport, we do it with our water system, our wastewater system, we have planning studies done and we follow those with very little diversions from it...step A has to take place, step B and obviously funding that's into it but we're very disciplined in other planning studies that we do and I'm hoping that we take this study and use it in a similar manner whether it's we do a million and a half dollars a year or we do eight hundred thousand dollars a year. If we're very disciplined and we follow the steps because I think that's what you gave us is a plan to work with and again I want to thank you for doing a great job.

Mayor Guinta asked any final questions.

Alderman Roy stated a couple of things I took away from this and like my colleagues I think you did an excellent job not only in inventorying but giving us a game plan that we can work on for the next few years. My ward is Ward 1 where Livingston Pool and the Gatsas Athletic Complex is housed and one of our criticisms is always children from other communities in some cases being bused in and my question is semi-broad but feel free to give a brief answer. In your experience is that typical for a community of our size when you base the numbers of one pool to 50,000 people is that the host community or does that bring into the surrounding towns that don't have pools...what were those figures based on and what advice would you give us there?

Ms. Holberg replied I'm short on advice about what to do. You've obviously got a spectacular facility and it's getting its more than fair share of attention. When we developed the standards for the City of Manchester we looked at the intensity of use and it did not go unnoticed that this pool is intensely used and it's a great pool and it's the best pool and if there were perhaps three other pools that were great and the best or some great beaches maybe the intensity of use or focus on that one pool could be spread throughout. We can't address the philosophical question of do you allow visitors from other communities and if not how do you do that that's beyond the scope of our approach.

Alderman Roy asked in your experience is the limitation typical or non-typical or is it just up to the community?

Ms. Holberg replied it's up to every individual community and how they handle it.

Mayor Guinta stated Alderman Shea has the final word.

Alderman Shea stated I think that this community provides a great deal of recreational opportunities for kids. It's not half full it's three quarters full. We have four pools in this

city, we have gymnasiums in several of the schools, we have recreational programs for kids, we have kids that play hockey that get scholarships to college, we have kids that play basketball here that get scholarships to college, we have an excellent recreational program here. Mr. O'Neil mentioned about advocating for different priorities which I said initially which one of the Aldermen picked me up on, I believe, I'm not for taking this and discarding it. I'm for putting this into its proper perspective by looking at it and prioritizing what we can afford, what we need and what will be the most beneficial for all the people. We have senior citizens in our community, which we haven't said one word about. We've talked about recreation for kids, we've talked about riding trails, but we have citizens that pay the bill in the city, which should be recognized. We should have walking areas in some of the areas. So, basically, when we discuss these particular issues we have an excellent program for kids, we have a wonderful Parks, Recreation and Cemetery Department, excellent dedicated workers, we have commissioners that spend their time and volunteering their time. So, if we all work together and do what's right for the citizenry we will benefit and your study obviously picks out important aspects of it and nobody in their right mind would expect us to fund all of these things but certain things have been pointed out...but, it's up to us through the leadership in the community to point out and prioritize kinds of things that can be systematized so that as we go along in '06, '07, '08 and '09 and so forth we can pick out those things which would be most beneficial for all the citizens. Thank you.

Mayor Guinta stated well put.

Alderman O'Neil stated just one final...in your professional opinion...how often should we...Alderman Lopez mentioned it might have been 18 years ago...don't remember when the last Parks Master Plan was done...

Alderman Lopez interjected in 1992.

Alderman O'Neil stated I believe that was done in-house, correct?

Alderman Lopez replied that's correct.

Alderman O'Neil stated now that we have this document how often should we have a firm like yours or someone else professionally update it? Is there a trend or a standard...I know you've laid out...I guess it's a 10-year plan, five years of capital improvements...how often should it be updated?

Ms. Holberg replied I believe that UPARR would like to see communities update their RAP on a 5-year basis...that hasn't been done here...this is a 10-year Master Plan and it should be completely renovated in 10 years or perhaps in the ninth year so in the tenth year you have another plan in place.

Alderman O'Neil stated you lost me for a minute...you mentions five years and you mentioned ten years.

Ms. Holberg stated the RAP should be updated in five years...where are we in implementation of this RAP...where are we going in the next five years we lay out a capital improvement program for just the first five years. The Master Plan should be updated in 10 years, no more than 10 years.

Mayor Guinta stated thank you very much we appreciate it.

Alderman Lopez moved to accept the plan for implementation and recommendation from the Superintendent and Parks and Recreation Commission.

Alderman Forest duly seconded the motion.

Mayor Guinta stated that's the motion you would like to make.

Alderman Lopez replied yes.

Alderman Gatsas stated I don't have a problem accepting the plan but implementation as Alderman Shea was talking about...it's \$15 million for implementation. So, I guess I would accept the plan if you want to change your motion, Alderman.

Mayor Guinta stated can we accept it as a plan and then refer it to CIP for review of our implementation.

Alderman Lopez stated I think the first year CIP...I think the Superintendent has submitted for the first year already certain priorities...they're going to submit their recommendations to CIP and then it would be up to the Board but unless they follow some type of sequence...they're recommendations might not be what we're going to give them because we don't have the money but at least they're moving ahead and some of the recommendations are coming forward. So, when I say implementation they've already submitted the plan to the Mayor for CIP already for the first year.

Mayor Guinta stated let me make just one comment and then I'll turn it over to Alderman O'Neil. I do think there's obviously a further discussion I believe all Board members want to have about the cost, by my calculations if you accepted and spent the \$15 million that would equal over time a ten percent (10%) tax hike. I think what we'd like...

Alderman Lopez interjected, your Honor, if I might for clarification on my motion. Accepting the plan...it's a blueprint, I think somebody has already indicated that and it's no more than in the 1992 plan that came forward.

Mayor Guinta stated I don't have a problem accepting the plan. Again, what I was saying is I think what we should do is...there seems to be an interest in having a further discussion about the priorities within this blueprint that I think can happen in committee.

Alderman Lopez stated certainly...the CIP Committee is where it's going to go.

Mayor Guinta stated that would certainly be my recommendation.

Alderman O'Neil stated I think what this is doing by accepting the plan is setting up a framework, I believe, is that what Alderman Lopez is saying.

Alderman Lopez stated that is exactly what I'm saying.

Alderman O'Neil stated there's at least one other document that probably should accept and there's a Maintenance Manual I guess that is in paper form or is it only on...we probably should accept that at some point when that becomes available to us so again we use these documents as tools as we move forward...am I missing anything else or is that the only other document that's part of this? Just one question of Andrew...you mentioned you could go on and this is maybe something we could just do in working with our own staff but go on-line and look at a park as part of the condition assessment. I think you might have mentioned you rated parks A through F or something.

Mr. Schrauth replied 1 through 5...just conditions, not the parks themselves, but the resources within the parks.

Alderman O'Neil stated that we in working with staff go on-line and look at that.

Mr. Schrauth stated by on-line what you can do is if you have access to the geodatabase program yes you can open up that program and open up those files.

Alderman O'Neil stated that doesn't exist in paper form.

Mr. Schrauth replied no.

Alderman O'Neil stated it would probably be a waste to put it into paper form.

Mr. Schrauth stated yes.

Alderman Osborne moved to refer it to the Committee on CIP.

Mayor Guinta stated there's a motion on the floor by Alderman Lopez. So, we would have to amend that.

Alderman Gatsas may I have a clarification of that motion please.

Mayor Guinta stated why don't we have clarification from the Clerk regarding the motion that should be put forward.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated the motion on the floor is to accept as a blueprint the Parks and Recreation Master Plan and refer to the Committee on Community Improvement for further recommendations regarding implementation.

Alderman Forest duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Osborne stated I have no problem sending it to CIP but I think the recommendation of accepting it should be done at CIP and then forwarded back to the full Board. Why should we accept it this evening?

Mayor Guinta stated it's a procedural motion. It's not accepting it in terms of funding, I think it's just a procedural motion that traditionally we have done as a Board, just as a matter of recognition that the Plan has been done and presented to the Board of Aldermen.

Mayor Guinta called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

5. Any other business relating to the Parks, Recreation and Cemetery Department.

Mayor Guinta asked is there any further business from the Board. A motion would then be in order to adjourn.

TABLED ITEM

6. Report of the Committee on Administration/Information Systems recommending that Gill Stadium be taken out of the Enterprise system in FY2006. *(Note: Board voted on May 3, 2005 this item be referred to the next BMA initiating office in 2006 recommending that Gill Stadium be considered a top priority in being moved out of the enterprise system; and report tabled on 01/17/2006 to be considered by the second meeting in February 2006.)*

Alderman Lopez asked are we going to take the item off the table and talk about Gill Stadium tonight and moved to remove item 6 from the table for discussion. Alderman Smith duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Gatsas stated at the last meeting we had we talked about waiting to have that discussion when we were in the budget process. Why would we be taking it off the table this evening? We're going to have the budget process and we're going to have the discussion about Gill Stadium I think that would be the proper venue to have it.

Alderman Lopez stated I think it was brought up at the last meeting that the Mayor was going to set up a special meeting for Parks to kill two birds with one stone, am I correct or am I incorrect?

Mayor Guinta replied we had talked about a number of issues possibly reviewing the report by the Finance Department and the Master Plan and then dealing with Gill Stadium. If you want to have a discussion about it tonight I'm okay with that but I think we still need the benefit of having the review of the plan presented by Randy Sherman in order to make some decisions. I'm not looking to delay...I talked to Alderman O'Neil about having this discussion tonight and my thought was we'd probably do that after both have been reviewed which obviously we'd be looking to do in February. But, if you want to have a discussion on it.

Alderman Lopez stated I think it was the main reason why Randy Sherman sent us a packet on it to review it before this meeting. I think that most Aldermen received it in plenty of time to review it and as to whether or not we're going to move Gill Stadium out of the Enterprise System and into the General Fund. I thought this was all going to take place...you have to put your budget together...you'll know which direction it was going to go rather than waiting until the next meeting.

Mayor Guinta stated that's true. It could happen tonight, it could happen in February...I think the idea is to send some parameters to me during the budget process.

Alderman O'Neil stated last week in the spirit of compromise I did agree to that and I think and I don't want to speak for you it might be helpful if you had some direction or guidance from the Board of where the Board may be going so that there's not a lot of wasted time on this. For some reason, I don't know why...I have personal feelings about Gill Stadium as do many of the members here. There's no sense on having this long drawn out battle over Gill Stadium. We should probably take a vote on where the Board wants to go and then move on from there. I think there was a lot of information and what Mr. Sherman provided, I think there was an 11-page, an 11 or 12-page response from Mr. Ludwig to that...we can have these other discussions about the arenas and McIntyre and Derryfield Country Club and I may be missing one but I just don't think that Gill Stadium belongs in those discussions...that's my personal opinion.

Mayor Guinta called for a vote on the motion to remove item 6 from the table for discussion. The motion carried with Alderman Gatsas and Garrity duly recorded in opposition.

Alderman Lopez stated I'll start off the discussion that I think the direction the Commission of Parks and Recreation boils down to that...we have all of the documents and counter action as to direction that Gill Stadium should take...to provide quality recreational facilities and programs to serve the public and enhance the quality of life. I think that Gill Stadium is a area where we've already spent millions to renovate and we get very little revenue in return because of the policies of the Board and I sanction that policy because Gill Stadium is a jewel in the City of Manchester for use to play all activities there. I, for one, have been in the Enterprise System when I was a Parks and Recreation Commissioner...I fought against it but I can tell you that when the Enterprise System started we were not able to do very many items in recreation as far as maintaining our facilities that went on for five years for swimming pools which I think Gill Stadium has also proven the same way...it's not a revenue producing area and we've always had to come to the General Fund in order to support Gill Stadium as all the Aldermen know even during the renovations at Gill Stadium for the Fisher Cats. It's an item that where you have a \$250,000 operation or \$240,000..let's break it off at \$250,000 that we give the money to Parks either through the School Department or to Parks as a subsidy...this has been going on and on. I really believe that in order for Parks to look at the Enterprise System where the West Side ice Arena and McIntyre Ski area and the golf course...it would be better if Gill Stadium was out of the Enterprise System so that they can move forward because all it's been is a fight after fight after fight...I can remember back when a \$300,000 subsidy came up in the budget wh9ch Randy Sherman has indicated in Mayor Baines' budget last year and we took it out. I remember when Bill Cashin and Alderman Wihby argued to keep the \$300,000 in there as a subsidy. For those of you who don't know I was on the original negotiating committee when all this came down regarding the Enterprise System as a commissioner and we were charging the School Department \$600,000 or \$650,000 for use of our facilities and as time went on they said why should they pay that much and now it's still about \$125,000 for Gill Stadium. So, it's just a headache and a half all the way around and it's not benefiting the youth, it's not benefiting the political structure, it's not benefiting the city and yet we continue to argue about Gill Stadium. We put \$4.5 million into it and there's no way the Enterprise System could even come near to supporting that. So, I really think and I'll let anyone else to speak to it but I've come to the conclusion that it's just like the swimming pools and it should come out of there and get it over with.

Alderman Osborne moved to return Gill Stadium into the City's General Fund. Alderman Smith duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Roy stated a lot of discussion has gone into Gill Stadium and a lot of discussion this evening and over the past couple of years and before that as Alderman Lopez summarized what we do with our parks and what we provide for the youth of the city. To

me this just breaks down into what the city needs to provide and the balancing act we need to do to pay for it all. When I look at Gill Stadium and I take into account what goes on there, the history of the ballfield, what's been done for the recent renovations and then what it could be in the future there's nothing that says if it was in or out of the Enterprise System that would make a difference. All of the things that are in the Finance Department report could be done if it was outside of the Enterprise System and a lot of the ideas and scenarios to raise extra funds could be done just as simply if it was in the General Fund. It's been subsidized according to this report since well before 1995, it's my philosophy that we should be providing a high level of quality fields to the youth and sporting teams of the City of Manchester and I'd supporting taking out of the Enterprise System and letting the Enterprise System focus on those things like Derryfield where there's greens fees and memberships, like McIntyre where there's ski passes and ski lessons and rentals and let's focus on improving those truly business-like activities where the funds can be generated and put back into those facilities to make those more profitable and then we can take Gill Stadium, increase some revenue...the air dome I like, the extra activities, the utilization in off season months...those are all things that could generate revenues but that could be done as part of the General Fund usage not as a true Enterprise System, so I would support taking it out.

Mayor Guinta stated before I go to Alderman O'Neil I'd like...if there's going to be a vote on this tonight and there sounds like there is because there's a motion on the floor I'd like five concrete reasons from a financial perspective to take it out of the fund, out of the Enterprise and into the General specifically. I guess particularly I'd like to have addressed what's going to happen...if you move it from the Enterprise to the General what's going to change operationally and what service is going to change. It sounds like the concern you have in moving it from one to the other is because there's not a service being provided or it's not being taken care of properly and I'm not convinced that anyone who's really provided amply reasoning to see an increased level of service to the community.

Alderman O'Neil stated I won't answer that but the point I was going to make when I did have my hand up...we could go...I thought we could take a parallel course of the Enterprise out as the budget was prepared but based on what information I've gotten from the two departments that are part of this over the weekend that's not going to happen and it's going to be a war all through the budget process over this thing and I'd rather get it over with now, the direction we're going to go so as you prepare your budget you have a direction and I think the Board will established what direction it wants to go. Gill Stadium alone is going to cause a division but we're going to get hung up on it continually over the next few months if we don't take a vote on it tonight. So, that's my opinion, your Honor.

Mayor Guinta stated if the vote is going to happen tonight I would still like to see five concrete reasons that make sense for removing it from the Enterprise. Right now, what people are saying is there's a subsidy. The subsidy exists whether it's in the Enterprise or whether it's in the General. The question I think from a policy perspective is what message

do you want to send to Parks and Recreation whether we send the message that Gill Stadium should be a revenue generating entity or should it be a complete 100% subsidy. I think the message you're sending if it goes into the General Fund is it becomes a complete subsidy. If it stays in the Enterprise it can be revenue generating and people are shaking their heads but if you're saying no then what's the reason of pulling it out in the first place.

Alderman Roy stated I can't answer for the other members of this Board but when I look at it being part of the General Fund and I don't take the revenue side out of that. I take it as a philosophical idea that we're going to provide a fantastic stadium for the youth sporting teams and the high school programs of the city that may in some years require a subsidy but is not a money generator, it's not managed with the sole idea of McIntyre and the Derryfield Country Club supporting itself and raising money for the city on an on-going basis and that's much the way that I look at Livingston Pool...it's there to provide a service for the constituents of this city that they may not be able to have in their backyard but it's something that we can't go out and say okay greens fees this year are going to be "X" and then next year we're going to raise them by 4% to cover our cost increases. Gill Stadium is used by a number of different programs for a number of different events on a sliding scale of time through the year so I look at it that we're providing a service and a facility much like we do with pools versus we're providing an entertainment factor like skiing or golf is and that's where I really differentiate the two whether or not it should be Enterprise or should it be in the General Fund.

Alderman Osborne stated I was born in Manchester and I used to go to Gill Stadium...we used to call it the Athletic Field then...you're not from Manchester so you can't visualize what happens with that stadium but I used to go there when I was younger from grammar school going to Lincoln Street...still in Ward 5, of course...but we used to go there for track and so forth. This was never a big money maker to begin with. It was put there for that reason like Alderman Smith says for the schools, the high schools...we had some wrestling there and things of that sort back then but it was never a big money maker, it was put there by the city for that reason for the people and the citizens of Manchester and I think right now it's still the same way. It actually started losing some money but I think overall I think we could manage it either way whether it's in the Enterprise or whether it's in the General Fund...the city can still manage that the same way, it's just a name whether it's General or Enterprise...it doesn't mean anything. Also the time element here...there's no time left at that field. How much more can you make over there, you can't make anymore money, if you break even you're lucky. So, I think it's time to move on...I made a motion and I think we had a second and take the vote.

Mayor Guinta stated the history of the Enterprise funds is back in 1995...there was a comprehensive review to determine how we can better improve quality services to establishing Enterprise funds as a means of generating revenue so you wouldn't have to go to the taxpayers to bond operations or improvements. If you remove it from the Enterprise it's

going to do a couple of things. If and when you have to bond for improvements it'll impact our debt ratio number one which I know the earlier committee heard...I assume heard what our debt ratio is right now which is something we've got to get our hands around, number one. So, you're going to increase that...not this year but anytime there's an improvement it's going to come out of CIP cash or CIP bonding. Secondly, as a matter of policy you're reversing the decision that started under Ray Wieczorek and was continued under Mayor Baines relative to the Enterprise fund. Mayor's Baines' decision to remove the \$300,000 subsidy, I think, was a message sent to Parks and Recreation and the Enterprise funds that these entities need to make money. Now, the decision for the concern that Alderman Smith raised at the last meeting was how are we going to balance the need to generate revenues for self-sustaining and how do you at the same time provide the service to kids in the community. We have not, in my opinion, had real ample opportunity to study the financial number one that was done...the report that was done by Randy and number two we haven't looked at alternative methods of revenue so I'm not sure why...I'm certainly willing to entertain the discussion but I would think at the very least we would take a look over the next 30 days and it's well before I present a budget as to what possible areas we can identify and remember as a Board we accept this policy...Alderman Lopez said it earlier tonight that he supported this policy. Well, I think we need to have a discussion about the policy. If you've made your internal decisions and your policy is to move it out because you feel it should be service which equals subsidy then it will impact the tax rate and I think that everybody needs to be clear...it will, there's no question it will. Right now you bond out of Enterprise it doesn't impact our tax rate and our bonding capacity. If we bond in the General Fund it does.

Alderman Lopez stated right now we give \$125,000 to the School Department to use Gill Stadium and we give another \$115,000 out of the General Fund to Parks so they can let youth activities/sports activities play at Gill Stadium...so, we're giving tax dollars to that. Like I said you're right the policy when it was first established going into the Enterprise Fund took five years to finally find out and make a decision that the swimming pools we couldn't charge because there's no way to make the money on swimming pools having someone down there taking the money and so now after all this time we're finding out that Gill Stadium because of the policy and the political aspects we're giving \$240,000 out of the General Fund now so that the youth activities can play at Gill Stadium and another point that I want to make is the fact that every time something comes up at Gill Stadium the taxpayers do pay for it...we just put a lot of money into Gill Stadium and when the locker situation came up they came to the Riverfront Committee for more money and we paid more money to Gill Stadium for the use...I wanted to bring that point out to you but I appreciate you're letting me speak.

Mayor Guinta stated if you're trying to address the issue of subsidy rather than remove it from one system to another system why not ask for a review of potential new revenue sources so you can still allow kids in the community to use...as a Board we have not

instructed Finance or Parks and Recreation to bring forth proposals and I'm sure there's some recommendations in Randy's report but again has everybody read through the report?

Alderman Smith stated we're Aldermen and we're here to serve the public but we're also here to serve our youngsters and especially in education and athletics. I understand the Mayor's viewpoint, I can understand Finance's viewpoint but I'll tell you what if we use a user's fee for these individual groups and I'll speak for Sweeney Post American Legion...I've been Athletic Officer for 30 years...we will be paying...if you follow the calculations in this book we'll be paying eight hundred plus dollars a day to play a game at Gill. Do you know what that means...that means no one is going to be utilizing a \$4.7 million facility and I'd just like to say that the Central High Booster Club raise funds and we've mentioned in this report...I'd like to say it again...in this report concessions. The Central High Booster Club runs the concession stand for about 6 or 7 weekends during the football season and that's a fundraiser for them. Fellas, I'll tell you right now it costs \$75/game right now at the present time because Parks and Recreation made it affordable for us, for our youth. It cost \$56 for baseballs, \$110 for umpires...now that's just Sweeney Post...if this is the way it's going to be it would be cheaper to go play a game out-of-town than play at Gill Stadium. I commend Parks and Recreation for keeping the price affordable for our youth and I hope that you will follow and get this out of the Enterprise finally.

Mayor Guinta stated I would just ask everyone to turn to page 21 and read 3.4.2 regarding advertising revenues...there are certain suggestions about additional advertising revenue that I don't think this Board has fully considered and if you want to keep the cost reasonable there are alternatives other than subsidies.

Alderman Forest stated in reference to taking this out of the Enterprise fund and whatever this has been in and out of the Administration Committee in the four years that I've been here and I think it started when Alderman Gatsas was Chairman, it came back to the Committee when I was Chairman, we've had the arguments from Finance and other Aldermen about what we can collect or what we can't collect...there was a heated discussion one night in my committee...accusations were flying here and there...how much money we could make here and everything else and I've read those reports, I've heard all the arguments, I've been listening to it for our years along with other Aldermen and what you said, Mr. Mayor, about giving you five reasons why we're voting the way we're voting well the only one I have to answer to is my constituents and the taxpayers in my ward. I believe I've done that and again like other Aldermen I'd like to move the question.

Alderman DeVries stated since we have Finance Department here I'd like to take the benefit of asking them after we completed the capital asset improvements at the Derryfield Country Club those were revenue bonds I believe that we generated for that project and I'm wondering the capacity left in the Recreation Enterprise after the completion of that particular activity.

Mr. Clougherty replied unlike the other enterprises water, Airport where they have their own credit rating, their own revenue stream, their own history...those are issued as legitimate revenue bonds...stand alone, separate official statement recognized on Wall Street as a separate stand alone enterprise. The Parks Enterprise has not matured to that level so any bonds that are issued for Parks and Recreation have been General Fund Obligation Bonds. They are paid out and charged to the Enterprise (principle and interest)...now that's no different from the way that the Airport used to be. It wasn't too long ago that the Airport was in the same situation as the Park's Enterprise.

Alderman DeVries stated my question would be and I'm referencing the report that we happen to have in front of us tonight for long term debt. As such General Obligation Bonds...it goes against the same bonding capacity the 9.7% of the equalized value...it's in the same capacity as any other...whether it's in the Enterprise or Recreational Enterprise on the city side, correct.

Mr. Clougherty stated even though they are issued as General Obligation Bonds and it's important to understand that distinction when we explain it to the credit rating agencies we explain that it is from the Enterprise and that the Enterprise revenues are what's going to go to defer the cost of those bonds. So, in that sense it does not come across on the city's overall debt level. As the Mayor explained it does not have the same impact.

Alderman DeVries asked where is that referenced within the report we have before us tonight?

Mr. Clougherty replied I'm not sure it's specifically referenced. Is it in there Randy? I don't think we did.

Alderman DeVries asked why would that not have been reported in our Comprehensive Annual Financial Report as not going against the equalized face valuation.

Mr. Clougherty stated I'm sorry the report...I thought the report you were referring to was this report...the CAFR is what you're referring to. The Comprehensive Annual Financial Report understand is a report on the total city operations so a lot of what's reported in that document is at a hierarchy that's rolled up with a lot of those bonds from everything that we do. So, that's what's reported. If you wanted the specific breakdown of any one of those numbers and what's contained in there that's certainly available...that's presented to you as part of the quarterly reports that you get from the Treasurer.

Alderman DeVries stated I understand that but I'm looking because we alluded to the debt capacity that it has a higher debt capacity if it's in the Enterprise System than it does on the government side, the city side and in trying to answer that based on the debt limits laid out to

us tonight I don't see it reported out separately under its own...it does seem to me to be part of the same capacity threshold that we maintain on the city side.

Mr. Clougherty stated a lot of the misunderstanding on Gill and the Enterprise is that when the Enterprise was created understand what the problem was. All of the city's recreational assets were going down and the reason they were going down is because they were all in the General Fund and what was happening was all of the money that you were making on Derryfield Country Club which has been making money for years is going to subsidize everything else and it was never going back into the recreational facilities. So, the reason that you set up the Enterprise was so that you could take the money from JFK and from Gill and recommit that money exclusively to your Park Enterprises rather than to the General Fund so that as Alderman Lopez said is when your commission actually had dollars to do some things and to make some improvements and I think everybody including the consultants and they talked about that. So, it wasn't put into the Enterprise because the expectation was that everybody would be user fee'd to death to try and make these things work. It was the understanding that some of these recreational facilities could take the benefits of the productive elements of the Enterprise and those could be recommitted. If you take Gill Stadium out of the Enterprise it is in the General Fund...at that point in time it's no different than it was back when it was in a state of disrepair. You're going to have to have a General Fund commitment to pay for any bonds that are going to be used to make repairs, it's going to have to compete with not just the recreational facilities it's going to have to compete with the roads and the sewers...not the sewers because that's paid through EPD but the roads and all of the other parks facilities as well.

Alderman Shea stated here are the five reasons. First of all Parks and Recreation Department will not need a subsidy. The Economic Development Director can focus his marketing skills...we hired him to market his skills so he can be utilized in this regard. The Finance Office will utilize their skills to improve its development. Also, the general public will benefit because of the upkeep of Gill Stadium and will be maintained without necessarily causing undue distress when it needs to be repaired and other Enterprise operations will benefit. Right now, there's a great deal of discussion among seniors. They call me and keep saying look I'm 82 years, I'm 78 years old I'm paying extra fees because I'm subsidizing Gill Stadium because they're being charged more money in order to maintain their golfing in order for Parks and Recreation to pay off whatever the needs of Gill Stadium might be. So, those are five reasons...after somebody else talks I'll list another six, seven, eight, nine and ten, your Honor.

Mayor Guinta stated I'm looking forward to six through ten.

Alderman Shea stated well I appreciate your giving us that opportunity. I can see your problem, your Honor, because you have to make sure that the tax rate is kept below 1.6 or thereabouts hopefully and therefore any money that's added to the General Fund, of course,

will be reflective in this particular addition to Parks and Recreation or any other department. So, I can understand that there has to be discussions and I appreciate your efforts that your using in order to stimulate discussion which is certainly a welcomed type of situation which obviously was never part of other kinds of situations but by the same token, your Honor, I do think that decisions have to be made and if they're not made at a certain time obviously as others have pointed out it just goes on and on so I thank you.

Mayor Guinta stated one question for Alderman Shea. You mentioned golf fees are in excess of what they should be as a result of this being in the Enterprise Fund...is it the intention of you or the Board to reduce golf fees once this is removed?

Alderman Shea replied no I believe that the fees should be utilized to improve the golf course, your Honor, and that's not been possible because as reports have been listed here if funds aren't being used for the golf course repairs and things of that nature and have to be moved over to taking care of expenses in another type situation then that's going to suffer eventually and that's why I brought that up.

Alderman Gatsas stated Kevin I guess my question comes back to you and if you could come up because I like Alderman O'Neil has taken the time to read this report and have several questions so if you'll indulge me maybe we can at least understand that we don't live in two separate city's here...an enterprise city and a tax city because I believe that if we start separating departments based on revenue sources because of bonding situations I think that we could look at bonding situations. When we talk about dedicated funds to pay for those things which I'm sure when you go down to bonding counsel you could separate because that's basically what you're doing now when we go through the ratios. So, I guess we don't tell any other department in the city...Finance doesn't create a revenue source, do you? Do you create revenue for the city?

Mr. Clougherty replied we invest funds daily that makes a few dollars.

Alderman Gatsas asked does your department bring revenue to the city similar to the Tax Department, similar to parking?

Mr. Clougherty replied we're responsible...again Alderman for investing the dollars. Our we out there and manufacturing or doing or charging people no.

Alderman Gatsas stated okay so you're not generating a revenue to the city. So, for us to take a single department like Parks, divide it into two and say one-half of this department is an Enterprise Fund, the other half belongs to the city and we've got to put tax dollars in there to do it makes no sense. We don't do that with any other department...traffic generates meter money. I would think that we would take the Parks Department, create it as a single department...if there are shortfalls as there were shortfalls with paving two years ago or in

the Welfare Department three years ago the city came to the plate and took care of that department. I don't think we're going to allow anything to fall through the floor because we aren't going to put dollars there because the revenue hasn't come in. I would think you would take Parks, treat it as a department, take the revenue, put it into the revenue stream of the city and let them operate. Have them come to the budget just like the Highway Department does, we can generate the things that people are talking about by revenue, by signage...all of those things can happen. But, why do we put the burden on one department to say you live with what you earn and you know what we won't help you and we're going to take one piece of that high cost item out and now I look at this report and we spent \$4.5 million and somebody's telling me we need a roof and the ramps going up need improvements and I'm sitting there saying wait a minute where was I didn't that just happen a couple of years ago.

Mr. Clougherty stated it sounds good that we'll just go back to where it was but the problem was when you have the system that you just described in place for 20 years all of your parks facilities were depleted, they were all running down, they were terrible and the reason was that you took that subsidy that was coming from what Alderman Shea said...those fees from those golfers and we didn't apply it back into the Enterprise operations you applied it to the General Fund generally for tax relief and what happened was everything deteriorated. So, at that point the golfers that Alderman Shea is talking about they weren't subsidizing the golf course, they were subsidizing the General Fund and what was happening was money wasn't even going back into the golf course. So, by setting up the Enterprise you at least said that there are certain functions that this city carries out that are different from tax collection, different from auto registration that are business enterprises like golf course and like...

Alderman Gatsas interjected stop for a second because if we run it as a business and if somebody told me that the greens fees there should be ninety dollars a day we don't want to do that. We say to you run it as a business but you know what you can't run it as a business when you're charging because we want don't want you to charge the taxpayers of this city that. I don't disagree with that but I look at this problem and say we're taking somebody and we're saying to them well what you did 20 years ago...what happens...right now, they have 40,000 rounds of golf. If next year it rains everyday and they only have 5,000 what do we tell the Enterprise fund we're not going to give you the money you need to bail yourself out of the General Fund.

Mr. Clougherty stated yes that's exactly what you tell water and that's exactly what you tell Airport and that's exactly what you tell EPD and what they have to do...

Alderman Gatsas interjected then if that's what we tell those departments why wouldn't we as a city say enough of this foolishness that we say that half of a department is an Enterprise Fund and the other half isn't. Let's do what we do with every other department and say collect your money, run your department, come to us for a budget and you know what if the

parks on one side of the city aren't being maintained then maybe the person running the department is the wrong person. Let's not blame it on other things, let's look at the factual things. Let's not say because we only had 10,000 rounds of golf this year we aren't going to help that Enterprise Fund out. My opinion is let them run the department, let them come to this Board for the money...we should appropriate the money to keep the parks in the condition that they're in and not let them fall apart.

Mr. Clougherty stated but Alderman there are...the operations of the golf course and the ski area and the skating rinks are the other places privately operated just as Airports are and water departments and the idea that...your premise that we're splitting a department you're doing the exact same thing at Highway. Why don't you bring in your sewer fees.

Alderman Gatsas stated you know what...don't go there because I would tell you when you look at their bottom line over there I would say that this city would be in pretty good shape if we did that because we never have a conversation about sewer fees and we never have that conversation about water because if you look at their bottom lines running it as a business they don't come here to ask us about adjusting rates we allow them to do it. So, if we're not going to do that then I agree with Alderman Smith...if it's \$800 to run a game then I'm not saying that's what we should advocate but we don't tell water you can't increase 15%. We tell Parks you know we're getting an awful lot of calls about increasing the greens fees.

Mr. Clougherty interjected maybe you should start doing that.

Alderman Gatsas stated that's easy for you to sit on that side you need to be an elected official and sit on this side.

Mr. Clougherty stated I understand, Alderman.

Alderman Gatsas stated so if we're going to say run a business let's truly say we're running a business and I don't see that department being a business.

Mayor Guinta stated this is the discussion that we were going to have...is what's the policy decision of this Board relative to Enterprise Funds and how they run.

Alderman Gatsas stated and I don't disagree with that, your Honor, and I think that going forward we take one department we tie his hands and say jeez if you only get 10,000 rounds of golf this year you've got a problem...work within your budget. You know if there's no snow and we have another 40-degree day and you can't make snow and you can't have skiers on the mountain well jeez I don't know what you're going to do.

Mayor Guinta stated I think the contributing factor is we have the ability to control it...right now, we're not controlling it and that's the concern that I have. Should we start looking at

the controlling factors, additional revenue sources. On page 22 of the Finance report talks about the concession revenues at Gill...they're \$1,800. I've got to think that we can probably somehow enhance that revenue and that's why I wanted to have the discussion of what's the policy relative to how we dictate businesses versus non-business entities on the city side.

Alderman Smith stated I did address the concession stand...it was put out to bid years and years ago but because of early spring and up until June it wasn't feasible for anybody to bid on it because there was only 50 to 100 people at a particular game and they had to be there...that was a contract with Parks and Recreation. The Central High Booster Club took it over after the Fisher Cats left and that was one of the things in this report they were saying that maybe the Fisher Cats will come down and run Gill Stadium...well, that means that the Central High Booster club which is working for youngsters in the city will not be able to run a concession stand. I'd like to point out in marketing...you don't think these fellas market...look at the signs, which I don't tremendously agree with outside of Gill Stadium. There were trees...when you go into Gill Stadium there's a big Coca Cola sign, you go down to the JFK Coliseum and there's the same thing...the Zamboni and everything...they've marketed and they've marketed well and another thing in this report...it says bring college teams in there. Two years ago we played at New Hampshire College, we played at St. A's...they were nice enough to give us a field while the Fisher Cats were there. There's no incentive for these teams to come down here...they have a better facility and they have their youngsters on campus and that's why they're going to be there. About the only thing you can do is bring in a tournament down at the new Riverfront Stadium if the Fisher Cats give you these dates. As far as the users fee it's just detrimental. I think the haves will have and the have nots will not be able to participate and that's entirely wrong with youth.

Alderman Lopez interjected may I make a clarification with the Finance people. In reference to your \$300,000...the \$300,000 when the Enterprise Fund was started was given to Parks to offset the Enterprise Fund...that money was taken away from them last year. With the \$300,000 they had before they had 94% and correct me the Superintendent's here funding for capital improvement of the Enterprise and we took away the \$300,000 last year and put them down about 79% and with the new deal that we got with the Derryfield Country Club it's just totally impossible, it's a question of the policy of this Board and I commend Alderman Gatsas for bringing up a few points there that are very important and Alderman Smith because we're kidding ourselves. Nobody will use Gill Stadium.

Mayor Guinta asked is there a consensus on the Board whether people would allow additional football games at Gill? Yes, generally speaking yes. Have you talked to anybody about additional football games at Gill? Have you talked to UNH about playing football at Gill? Okay, so we're not doing everything we can about revenue because I talked to UNH, they'd love to play there. We're not looking at this as a general revenue source.

Alderman Gatsas stated I don't question whether UNH would want to play there. You're talking about stands that are less than the capacity that they have.

Mayor Guinta stated they've told me...since I've taken office they'd love to play football at Gill. We are not...my point is we are not exploring every opportunity. Now, I don't think we should be pointing the finger at Parks, I think we need to point the finger at ourselves and determine what policy we would like to direct Parks in terms of generating revenue...that's the discussion we should be having.

Alderman Gatsas stated a question, your Honor. Does it matter if Gill Stadium was in the Enterprise Fund or not? That's what I'm saying. It doesn't matter where it is, it doesn't matter whether the golf place is in an Enterprise Fund, whether McIntyre is in an Enterprise Fund...if there's a problem and there's a shortfall this Board's going to come and bail that department out.

Mayor Guinta stated I agree but that's not a reason to take it out of the Enterprise Fund.

Alderman Gatsas asked why are we leaving it in there?

Mayor Guinta replied because I think at one point we need to set a policy about should it be a revenue generating strain so we can be self-sustainable. It's 8:45 so I'm going to go for a couple more minutes and then we'll take a vote on this because I think everyone probably has their decisions.

Alderman O'Neil stated I can only look at what the condition was at Gill Stadium in the Enterprise Fund and thank God that this Fisher Cats deal came along...easy Alderman Gatsas...but, it did allow us to put \$4.5 million worth of repairs into a facility that we are lucky some of the grandstands didn't collapse...that's how bad it was in the Enterprise System. We have three systems that work outstanding...the Airport, EPD and Water Works...they work outstanding as enterprises. I'm going to take a shot at five points, your Honor. Golf...you've got to be able to pay greens fees, you need golf clubs, golf balls and there's some concession money at the 19th hole afterwards usually. Hockey...the cost of skates...I have no idea, several hundred dollars anyway and the other equipment. So, there's money involved with playing hockey. Skiing...we certainly know ski equipment's very, very expensive. We pulled the swimming pools out because who's the users of swimming pools, right...the people who can't afford to have a swimming pool at their house and what do you need to use a swimming pool...a pair of swim trunks...that's it or a pair of gym shorts and to play football at Gill Stadium or soccer at Gill Stadium all you need is a pair of cleats and to play baseball all you need are cleats and a glove. My point of this is who is the end user? The kids. But, it's not generally the kids who have a lot of money, that's my point with this.

Mayor Guinta stated are you making the assumption that if we leave it in the Enterprise Fund kids of less economic means and others will not have the opportunity to play at Gill.

Alderman O'Neil stated I just heard Alderman Smith as somebody that knows first hand in a volunteer capacity in his position as the Athletic Director at the Henry J. Sweeney Post what it would cost...what he pays now, what it would cost to make it a true part of the Enterprise...he couldn't afford it, he made the statement it would be cheaper for him to take his team on the road the entire time.

Mayor Guinta stated he wouldn't include any additional revenues and then he walked out of the room and no ones even talked to UNH and there's a revenue source there.

Alderman O'Neil stated I agree with Alderman Gatsas in this. Why can't we enhance revenues and have it in the General Fund. I don't understand why we can't do that.

Mayor Guinta asked who would be in charge with that responsibility if it's in the General?

Alderman Lopez interjected, your Honor, a point of order here.

Alderman O'Neil asked how do other departments collect revenues? I don't know.

Alderman Lopez interjected, your Honor, a point of order here.

Alderman O'Neil stated I have the floor can I just finish.

Alderman Lopez stated I want to get a point of order in here, your Honor, because...

Mayor Guinta stated let Alderman O'Neil finish and then I'll give you your point of order.

Alderman O'Neil stated I would love for Finance to give me a definition of what an Enterprise System is. I can give you what my interpretation is...it needs to pay for itself. These facilities don't pay for themselves.

Mayor Guinta called upon Alderman Lopez.

Alderman Lopez stated if we're going to get into this debating from the Chair I'd appreciate very much that we not get into that type of dialogue debating when the Aldermen are debating. I'd appreciate that very much.

Alderman O'Neil stated I didn't interpret it as a debate, your Honor.

Alderman Gatsas stated neither did I, your Honor. I think we've heard those kinds of debates and opinions from the Mayor in the past.

Alderman O'Neil stated let's keep this civil we're having a good discussion here.

Mayor Guinta asked do we need to continue the discussion or can we have a vote? Final point, Alderman Roy.

Alderman Roy stated thank you, your Honor, for a final point and one question I guess for Kevin or Randy whoever wants to field this. When we look at West Memorial Field, Memorial High School Field and Gill Stadium what do you see as differences in usage for those ballparks or football fields. And, I preface that in comparison to golf memberships or greens fees or ski tickets.

Mr. Sherman stated let me start off by first of all...Memorial and over at your new Memorial field...100% of the costs incurred by the School are in the School budget which means that 100% of those costs are in their budget when they go out and charge tuition to the outlying communities. By subsidizing Gill Stadium and only charge them \$1,100 when maybe it should be \$1,900 or \$2,200 you're subsidizing Bedford, Hooksett, Auburn, Candia...you're subsidizing all those people because you're not charging them 100%. So, for every time that you give them a discount their tuition is going down...that's the number one reason why you shouldn't bring this back into the Enterprise Fund. Number two reason why you shouldn't bring it back into the Enterprise Fund is you're going to lose focus. We didn't focus on these facilities when they were part of the General Fund, you've lost your incentive to go out and raise those revenues. Yes...Building Department brings in revenues and other departments raise fees but because they're not accountable to cover a certain part of those costs you don't know if those fees are right. The definition of an Enterprise Fund is yes it should be self-sustaining but if it isn't what it does is it at least accounts for things so you know what those true costs are. Yeah, if you want to give it a subsidy that's fine, give it a subsidy but now you know what those true costs are.

Alderman O'Neil interjected can I just...and, Randy, not to counter you but we can look at the Police Department and we know what the cost to run the Traffic Division is, the cost to run...

Mr. Sherman stated no, you don't...

Alderman O'Neil interjected absolutely.

Mr. Sherman stated no you don't and that was the same thing we just saw with parking.

Alderman O'Neil stated no you can't put that in the same...you cannot. I guess we're going to have a little philosophical disagreement but we can ask those departments what it costs to do investigations, to run detectives, to run the drug unit, to run traffic, to run general patrol...so we can get that information.

Mr. Sherman stated it's got no legal fees, no finance fees, no HR fees, no debt...those fees aren't in there.

Mr. Clougherty stated the other thing with respect to your question too is the facilities that we have for educational purposes...those are eligible for reimbursement from the State from School Building Aid as well. Those dollars are again a much different arrangement.

Alderman Roy stated so if I'm listening to you correctly...first, Randy's answer was we're subsidizing the outlying towns and I assume that's the children that are playing sports that are registered in our schools so if we have 10 Hooksett kids on the Central football team we're subsidizing a small portion of those 10. The second part of your answer Kevin I guess would then lead me to believe why would we not take Gill Stadium and make it the equivalent of Manchester Memorial and West Memorial and go ahead and put it in with the school system.

Mr. Clougherty stated we've advocated that for a long time and if you were to do that that would have an impact on your bottom line...that would have a tremendous impact on your bottom line. But, you're going to have to have the School District make the application.

Alderman Roy stated but my question is and I see Alderman Smith's hand going up so I'll finish my train of thought...those funds that go to West Memorial and Memorial are allocated first in the Mayor's budget and then in the budget approved by this Board that are ultimately full taxpayer subsidized so all we're picking up is that small portion that's not getting into State Educational Aid and not being counted in tuition agreements with surrounding towns.

Mr. Clougherty stated again it may not be a small portion, it may be just enough to bring that facility, the overall enterprise because it's begin considered with all the others to a point where it's breaking even. It's not that Gill Stadium needs to be totally self-sufficient and it's not that we're advocating that it should be totally self-sufficient through user fees and everything else. If you can get it to the point where it's not such a drain on the other members or the other facilities in the Enterprise you've made a tremendous accomplishment there because you are not going to have the discipline as has been evidenced by the part 20 years and it gets back to Alderman O'Neil's point about Gill Stadium. Yeah it was in the Enterprise when you made the improvements but it was out of the Enterprise for 20 years and you never got to the point where you could really get the Enterprise itself working to

make the investment and what you ended up bailing Gill Stadium out with was a real creative entrepreneurial approach of having somebody else make those improvements.

Alderman Roy stated I agree with you on the improvements part but will agree to disagree. Thank you, Kevin.

Mayor Guinta stated we have Alderman Garrity, Smith and Gatsas and then I think we should take a vote.

Alderman Garrity stated I was just going to request to move the question and request a roll call.

Mayor Guinta stated okay two quick points...Alderman Smith and then Alderman Gatsas.

Alderman Smith stated I'm sorry to continue this but Parks and Recreation probably gives more community services at no cost than any other department. I'd just like to list some of them: Central High Booster Club for concession, Clem Lemire Hockey Tournament, Freshman Football Jamborees, High School Football Jamborees, Winter Ski Passes/Winter Carnival, they also give free golf tournaments and one thing I'd like to point out Manchester High School sports teams no charge for Derryfield Country Club or McIntyre. So, they are sustaining and with their good will that's the reason why...now, do you want...if you want to put a users fee on it they're going to charge...they have no other choice and they're trying to make everything affordable. I don't mind paying someone but I don't want to pay an outrageous amount like what was in this report because a calculation says it should be \$206 an hour. Thank you.

Alderman Gatsas stated I guess Kevin I come back to the premise that you talked about Airport, you talked about EPD and you talked about Water...Airport we don't control what they charge for parking, we don't tell them that Airport garage is used by 85% of the people in Manchester and you can't charge "X" amount of dollars you've got to charge less...we don't guide Manchester Water Works. They used to go to the PUC for rate regulation...they now have it in legislation that they can increase 15% on a given year, so we don't dictate to them.

Mr. Clougherty stated that's right I don't dispute that.

Alderman Gatsas stated and 70% of their water is distributed to people in Manchester.

Mr. Clougherty stated again with water you have the same subsidy question too. If you want to get into get into discussion of enterprises then we should do that but the same point that Randy raised on subsidizing Bedford and these other towns for recreational enterprises and the list that Alderman Smith just gave out was a list of things that are given away. If you

look at water the reason that your rates are what they are and they're lower than most other places in the state...I think you'll agree, right and lower than most other places even though we just increased them they're still lower than most other places and that's because other places are getting a payment in lieu of taxes. Think about this...we're the largest taxpayer in Auburn for the properties we own out there. None of the services that we're providing here get factored into that rate increase.

Alderman Gatsas stated but you're talking about a revenue source.

Mr. Clougherty stated again this is all about revenue sources, Alderman.

Alderman Gatsas stated you're absolutely right but if we took that department and what you're saying...20 years ago we never paid attention to parks...they were falling apart, the revenue source we had...we didn't have McIntyre, the only thing we had was the golf course.

Mr. Clougherty stated and all that money went into the General Fund and never back into the golf course.

Alderman Gatsas stated but it should be no different. He should come to us for a budget and say here's the budget, this is what I'm going to do with it...I'm going to take care of Livingston Park, I'm going to take care of Prout Park, I'm going to take care of East Little League and that's what I have to do.

Mr. Clougherty stated what we have found though is under that environment it sounds like...it always sounds great you're going to step up to the plate I'm just reminding you that that was not...there was not the political will to do that. You did not step up to the plate and take care of your parks, you used that money to pay for things in the schools or to pay for things in the Police Department or other priorities.

Alderman Gatsas interjected but Kevin I wasn't here 20 years ago.

Mr. Clougherty stated I understand, Alderman, but I'm saying we're under budget constraints now.

Mayor Guinta stated and my point is that's why it's a very important policy decision that you're about to make because you trust yourselves to make a decision and in two years a lot of us may not be here and new people will be in and may have different ideas about funding requirements in the General Fund. If you keep this in the Enterprise Fund you have some autonomy...you move it out there's a possibility that this becomes lower on the priority scale. It wouldn't to Alderman Smith, it wouldn't to Alderman O'Neil but how long is this

Board going to be in place which is why I think we need to make a decision based on the long term interests of the city not based on the interests of the 15 people in the room.

Alderman O'Neil stated just one final point. What was the year we pulled the pools out? I was on the Board as I recall.

Mr. Sherman replied I think it was '99.

Alderman O'Neil stated while they were in the Enterprise if there were repairs that needed to be done it came out of the Enterprise fund, correct. We have had to make significant improvements to our pools I believe Livingston has been done since it was pulled from the Enterprise, Raco Theodore is being done now, is Dupont in between that time, does anybody remember...that was General Fund and somehow we got through this. You're right, Kevin, you made a point earlier but we have to make some decisions and by pulling it out I certainly understand it may affect do we put a new roof on the fire station down on Calef Road or do we do something else but we have to make those decisions every year and somehow we've gotten through and it's been a struggle but we've gotten through and we've gotten the repairs done on our pools and I understand that and I think this is one where I think we just...as Alderman Roy said we respectfully disagree with you on it's just a philosophical thing.

Mr. Clougherty stated we're not...as part of the report...I'm a native of Manchester too, I played at Gill Stadium and I have a lot of good thoughts as Alderman Gatsas does and everybody going around the room here. My concern isn't anything other than to make sure that Gill will fall into disrepair again...that there will not be the discipline to make the resources available to take care of it.

Alderman O'Neil stated I respect and it's a legitimate concern and it did happen but I think we have to have faith moving forward that we all have learned...the various city departments and the elected officials. Thank you, your Honor.

Mayor Guinta stated there is a motion on the floor I think made by Alderman Lopez if I remember correctly and seconded by Alderman...if the Clerk will clarify.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated Alderman Osborne by Alderman Smith to remove Gill Stadium from the Enterprise Fund and place it into the General Fund.

A roll call vote was conducted. Aldermen Garrity and Gatsas voted nay. Aldermen Smith, Forest, Roy, Long, Duval, Osborne, Pinard, O'Neil, Lopez, Shea and DeVries voted yea. Alderman Thibault was absent. The motion carried.

Mayor Guinta vetoed the motion.

Alderman O'Neil stated with all respect, your Honor, I will move to override your veto.

Alderman Forest duly seconded the motion.

Mayor Guinta asked is that a roll call requirement.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson replied not a roll call requirement.

Alderman O'Neil requested a roll call vote.

A roll call vote was conducted. Aldermen O'Neil, Lopez, Shea, DeVries, Smith, Forest, Roy, Long, Duval, Osborne and Pinard voted yea. Alderman Garrity and Gatsas voted nay. Alderman Thibault was absent. The motion carried.

Alderman Gatsas moved to remove the stigma of Enterprise Fund from the Parks Department and allow it to run as a department as we do with the rest of the departments in the city. Alderman Osborne duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Roy stated one of the points that I heard in Alderman Gatsas' comments earlier was letting it run as a department and not coming to its aid if it needs to be bailed out and subsidized.

Alderman Gatsas interjected that's not what I said.

Alderman Roy stated there's one part of what you were saying...run it like a department much like Police or Fire if it needs a subsidy we'll be there for it like any other department. One of the comments that Kevin made was going back to 1995 when this was created was that revenues from some of our producing properties...Derryfield, McIntyre and the arenas went to Police and Fire and not reinvested in those areas making money.

Alderman Lopez interjected a point of order, please.

Alderman Gatsas stated can we finish the discussion, your Honor, somebody's got the floor.

Alderman Lopez stated I realize that but a point of order.

Mayor Guinta stated I think the point of order is relative to motions probably because of the agenda, is that correct.

Alderman Lopez stated that's correct.

Mayor Guinta asked is it appropriate to accept Alderman Gatsas' motion.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson replied there was an item on there that said any other business relating to Parks, so it would be appropriate.

Alderman Lopez stated thank you.

Alderman Roy stated one of my biggest concerns that if we take all of the money making enterprises for lack of a better word out of the Enterprise System is that should the economy change or the will of this Board change then those properties that are making money won't have the funds to reinvest in themselves and I look at the properties that we now have left in the Enterprise as ones that hit a broader group of people who are willing to pay those fees to go ahead and use them and in a sense we can reward them with the profit by maintaining and upgrading those facilities as part of a true Enterprise System like Water, EPD or Airport. I would look to keep what we have there in the Enterprise System so that it can do what a true Enterprise System does...be self-sufficient, make money, reinvest and hopefully make more money over the long run.

Alderman Gatsas stated if we're going to call it a true Enterprise System then let's let them run like the Airport, let them run like Water, let them run like EPD and if he wants to increase the greens fees to \$80 that's what he should do because if that's what the market will bear that's what the market will bear and if he wants to increase the lift ticket at McIntyre to \$90 because that's what the market would bear then let's let them run it as a true Enterprise but I can tell you that the phone calls will be coming from the people that are in the wards ringing off the hook. So, either we're going to say we let them run it because it's a city-owned position and we aren't going to charge market rates because we subsidize parking downtown because we don't allow parking garages in this city to charge what market rates are because we feel that if we do that we're going to have a problem. So, we do that all over the city. Let's let the department run it as a business or let's say go do what you need to do, let's find somebody that can go out and find those other revenue sources, we can find somebody and say you know what if you generate "X" amount of dollars maybe that's the way we pay you.

Mayor Guinta stated I would agree with that.

Alderman Garrity stated move the question, your Honor.

Mayor Guinta stated there's a motion on the floor...we're going to remove the stigma from the Enterprise.

Alderman Shea asked is there any more discussion?

Mayor Guinta called upon Alderman Shea.

Alderman Shea stated I'd like to hear from Kevin he's the Finance Officer for the city. We're making a decision that's probably, a sound one but yet we have to...maybe it isn't, I don't know.

Mayor Guinta stated I don't know if this has any financial implication.

Mr. Clougherty interjected yes it has big financial implications because you're going to have to take in all of the debt, you're going to have to take in all of the deficit...

Mayor Guinta stated I'm talking about the motion on the floor.

Mr. Clougherty stated right. If you do away with the Enterprise and you bring it into your General Fund now all that debt...

Mayor Guinta stated we already did that.

Mr. Clougherty stated no you took Gill out of the Enterprise.

Alderman Gatsas stated Kevin you just told me that when you go down to bond you tell them that it's an Enterprise Fund.

Mr. Clougherty stated we explain how it operates.

Alderman Gatsas asked is there a difference that if you said it was a...

Alderman Shea interjected I thought you said I had the floor, your Honor, I'm sorry...did I have the floor or not.

Mayor Guinta stated I was trying to let it go...we'll bring some order back. Right now, we have Alderman Shea, then we will go to another Alderman and then we are going to take a vote.

Alderman Shea stated thank you, your Honor. Kevin, could you explain fully what the implications will be in terms of doing whatever has been suggested.

Mayor Guinta stated as a matter of clarification would you read the motion.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated the motion is to remove the stigma of Parks and Recreation to run as an Enterprise and have it run as other departments. I'm not clear as to whether that means that the intent is to have them run as a true Enterprise or to run as a true department and I guess the Alderman making the motion should probably clarify that so that people understand.

Alderman Gatsas stated to allow it to run as we do in every other department in this city.

Mr. Clougherty asked in the General Fund?

Alderman Gatsas replied in the General Fund.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated so you're removing it from the Enterprise, is that the intent of the motion?

Alderman Gatsas replied that's correct.

Mayor Guinta stated everything that Parks runs...so Derryfield, McIntyre and the ice rinks...remove them all from the Enterprise Funds.

Alderman Gatsas replied correct.

Mayor Guinta stated that's the motion that you made.

Alderman Gatsas stated that's correct. I look at this and say either we're going to allow them to be an Enterprise Fund...if they're allowed to be an Enterprise Fund because they've been compared to Airport, Water and sewer. We don't dictate what Water, sewer and the Airport charge for anything.

Mayor Guinta stated I think there's probably a better way to resolve this issue than to remove them completely.

Mr. Clougherty stated we do adopt the water and sewer rates...they make recommendations.

Alderman Shea stated the implications.

Mr. Clougherty stated there are serious implications for stopping the accounting the way you're doing it because you have depreciation, you have all the debt in there and we would really recommend rather if you want to deal with this issue, Alderman, let us go back and pull together in a one-page all the pluses and minuses on this because it has serious ramifications. Once you know what they are and you have the information in front of you if you want to vote to move in that direction that's fine but at least understand what it's going to do to the bottom line of your General Fund.

Alderman Shea stated I make that a motion that we get the pros and cons from the Finance Office in order to make a very sound decision concerning the implications of what this particular motion is involved with.

Mr. Clougherty stated we'd show you what the financial implications would be.

Mayor Guinta stated there's already a motion on the floor.

Alderman Shea stated I would ask that they remove that motion.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated or he could merely put it as a tabling motion pending that report and table it till another meeting.

Alderman Shea stated I would recommend that they remove that motion from the floor, I would ask them to do that until we get all the financial implications involved with that particular decision that Alderman Gatsas has made. If he's willing to do that, yes. If he's not, no.

Alderman Gatsas replied no.

Alderman Lopez stated I strongly recommend not doing the Derryfield Country Club, the ski area or the ice arenas by taking them out at this stage of the game. We just went through a financial matter for the Derryfield Country Club and they're not having that major a difficulty like the swimming pools and Gill Stadium and to bring it all back at this time I think the Finance people...there's a lot of bonding aspects and you're going to pick up all of the stuff. Unless the Parks Director is indicating that he has a major problem in these areas I think that we ought to just leave well enough alone. I'll tell you from experience that we were able to do a lot in the Enterprise Fund in certain areas such as the Derryfield Country Club and McIntyre Ski area...some of the commissioners got tubing there. I'd strongly recommend not doing that, not during this budget season.

Alderman DeVries moved to table. Alderman Shea duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Gatsas asked what is being tabled the entire motion we just took off the table..

Deputy City Clerk Johnson replied it would be the motion to remove all Parks programs from the Enterprise Fund.

Alderman DeVries stated that is correct.

A roll call vote was conducted. Aldermen Gatsas, Osborne, Lopez, Garrity, Forest and Roy voted nay. Aldermen Long, Duval, Pinard, O'Neil, Shea, DeVries and Smith voted yea. Alderman Thibault was absent. The motion carried.

Alderman O'Neil stated I think it was important we had this discussion tonight because I think if it got brought into the whole budget discussion later in the spring it would just be messy...as least there's some direction on that one item and I think we can move on with everything else. Thank you, your Honor.

There being no further business to come before the Board, on motion of Alderman DeVries, duly seconded by Alderman Garrity, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

City Clerk